

FREEMASONRY and JUDAISM

Secret Powers Behind Revolution



Vicomte Léon De Poncins

VICOMTE LÉON DE PONCINS

THE
SECRET POWERS
BEHIND
REVOLUTION

FREEMASONRY AND JUDAISM

OMNI/CHRISTIAN BOOK CLUB
P.O. Box 900566
PALMDALE, CA 93590

ACHEVÉ D'IMPRIMER
LE 19 NOVEMBRE 1929
PAR F. PAILLART, A
ABBEVILLE (FRANCE)

Reprinted 1986
Reprinted 1996

SUMMARY

I

FREEMASONRY

INTRODUCTION TO THE MASONIC QUESTION

Difficulties of the problem.....	15
How we arrived to our present knowledge.....	16

FIRST PART

FREEMASONRY IN APPEARANCE

Definition of freemasonry	21
Origin of freemasonry.....	22
Organisation of freemasonry.....	23

SECOND PART

THE REVOLUTIONARY PART PLAYED BY FREEMASONRY IN THE WORLD

Freemasonry and the French Revolution of 1789....	28
Freemasonry in France from 1793 to our days.....	49
Revolutionary freemasonry in Europe :	
<i>Portugal, Spain, Italy, Turkey, Austria, Hungary.</i>	60
Freemasonry and the War of 1914-1918.....	77

CONCLUSION

What Freemasonry really is.	
Organisation of freemasonry : origin, aim, ways of proceeding, occult organisation.....	91
Jewish influence in freemasonry.....	100
English freemasonry.....	108

II

JUDAISM

INTRODUCTION TO THE JEWISH QUESTION

The statement of the problem.....	117
-----------------------------------	-----

FIRST PART

The revolutionary part played by Jews in the World..	119
Jews in modern revolutions.....	119
Jews and Bolshevism.....	127
Jews and Socialism.....	157
Jews and Economic Life	163
Jews and the Press.....	171
Jews in the modern world.....	178

SECOND PART

THE ORGANIZATION OF JUDAISM

General hostility between Jews and non-Jews	183
The Jewish race.....	187
The Jewish nation.....	187
The Jewish religion.....	197
The Jewish organizations.....	205
The Jewish line of action.....	219

SUMMARY

9

CONCLUSION

Good Jews and bad Jews.....	231
Is Judaism a conscious or unconscious destructive power	233

GENERAL CONCLUSION

FOREWORD

We are actually witnessing an immense revolutionary movement of which the first outward manifestation was the French revolution of 1789.

This movement, which, since then, has spread all over the world, has a much deeper significance than is generally supposed, and aims at the overthrow of civilization.

The fate of humanity is at stake, and it is of great importance for us to know the causes of the movement and its consequences, or, in a word, to know where we are going.

But among the revolutionary forces there are two, which, although more or less hidden and unknown to the public, are none the less primordial.

These are Freemasonry and Judaism.

It is these two forces which we wish to make better known¹.

It must be clearly understood that what follows applies to continental Freemasonry, the question of English masonry being treated separately at the end.

1. The aim of this work is not to produce new unpublished evidence but to set out and summarize the whole question for a reader who is supposed to be ignorant of the subject.

FIRST PART

FREEMASONRY

INTRODUCTION TO THE MASONIC QUESTION

WHAT IS FREEMASONRY ?

It is difficult to answer this question in a few words for the following reasons :

I. Freemasonry is a secret society.

It considers it necessary to conceal everything concerning it not only from outsiders but also from the great majority of its own members. Only a few chosen initiates know its real secrets. Its adepts collaborate unconsciously towards an aim of which they are ignorant, led by invisible chiefs whose very existence they sometimes do not even suspect.

II. Freemasonry has not an invariable and rigid form.

The work which it proposes to accomplish is so vast that the task is divided, each section of Masonry having its particular rôle, which varies according to countries, times and circumstances; so that if we ask several Free-Masons for a definition of Freemasonry, they can in good faith give us in Each case very different one.

III. Freemasonry conceals its true aim beneath vague formulas.

It purposely never explains in precise fashion what it

intends. By using vague formulas, those who direct it have been able, little by little, and without too obvious contradictions, to turn Masonry in the direction which they desired.

All this, taken together, makes Freemasonry a very complex problem. A part of the truth has however been discovered by the following means :

1. BY STUDYING MASONIC DOCUMENTS.

(Publications, reports of meetings, masonic correspondence, etc.).

This work is now facilitated in certain countries, such as France, where Freemasonry believes itself strong enough to throw off partly its mask.

2. BY STUDYING THE WORK OF FORMER MASONS.

(Such as Copin-Albancelli, Findel, Robison, etc.).

It has sometimes happened that a Freemason, having caught a glimpse of the truth, has felt himself in conscience bound to leave the association and to divulge its dangers to the public. A very few persons also succeeded in insinuating themselves into the Lodges in order to try to pierce the masonic mysteries. But these are exceptional cases. Freemasonry has known what measures to take for the avoidance of all indiscretions.

3. BY MEANS OF IMPORTANT MASONIC DOCUMENTS THAT HAVE FALLEN INTO THE HANDS OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE MADE THEM PUBLIC :

These cases occurred on three principal occasions :

a) In 1785 Lanze, a member of the masonic order of the Bavarian « Illuminati », who was carrying secret documents was struck by lightning at Ratisbon. When

the Police picked up his body, they discovered on him such compromising papers that the Bavarian government immediately took the matter up. A search was carried out among the papers of the sect which led to considerable further discoveries and ended in a celebrated trial. Weishaupt, the chief, was able to escape. All the documents seized could be seen in the archives at Munich. Copies were sent to all European governments, which, however, took no notice of them.

b) In 1815 the documents of the secret society : « the Haute Vente Romaine » came into the possession of the Vatican and were in part published by Crétineau-Joly in his book : *L'Église Romaine en face de la révolution*. On this occasion again copies of these papers were sent to all European governments but with no better success.

c) In 1919, upon the fall of Bela Kun, chief of the bolshevist revolution in Hungary, the government caused the masonic archives of the lodges in Buda-Pest to be seized. The revolutionary rôle of the Masons was clearly revealed ; all the lodges of Hungary were closed and Freemasonry forbidden.

4. BY ASCERTAINING THE MASONIC REVOLUTIONARY WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN THE WORLD DURING THE TWO LAST CENTURIES.

This work of disintegration extends to all branches : religion, politics, morals, arts, literature, etc., and to all countries. It is the most solid proof and the most tangible ; for, if it is easy to refute an argument, facts cannot be denied, and there are so many of them, that, according to the evidence it is no longer possible to preserve any doubt as to the real essence of Freemasonry.

From this study the true rôle of this universal association emerges little by little, and it may be briefly stated thus :

Freemasonry is a body of superimposed secret societies spread throughout the world.

Its aim is to destroy the present civilization based on Christian principles, to establish in its place an atheistic rationalist society which, in fact, leads straight to materialism although it is supposed to have science and reason as a religion. Appearances have often changed but this aim has remained unalterable.

The inner nature of the struggle is spiritual. It is a conflict between rationalism and the Christian idea, between the rights of God and the rights of man, who will become a man-god, directed by a state-god. In order to reach this final aim it was necessary to begin by undertaking the overthrow of monarchies representing the principles of authority and tradition, and to replace them, little by little, by the universal atheist masonic republic.

The rôle of Freemasonry is to create the revolutionary state of mind rather than to act directly.

We could quote in support of this brief summary numerous masonic documents. Here are a few taken at random :

To the French Republic, daughter of French masonry.

To the universal Republic of to-morrow, daughter of universal masonry... ¹

Freemasonry cannot do less than thank the sovereign Pontiff for his last encyclical. Leo XIII with incontestable authority and a wealth of proofs, has just informed us once

1. Toast of the President of the Grand Orient in 1923. *Convent du grand orient*, 1923, p. 403.

more that there exists an impossible abyss between the church, of which he is the representative, and the revolution, of which Freemasonry is the right arm. It is better for those who are hesitating not to keep up vain hopes. All must come to understand that the time has arrived for choosing between the old order, which rests upon Revelation, and the new order which knows no other foundation but science and human reason, between the spirit of authority and the spirit of liberty ¹.

Having briefly stated the problem, we are now going to study the question in detail and to show with proofs in support :

- I. FREEMASONRY IN APPEARANCE.
- II. ITS REVOLUTIONARY PART IN THE WORLD.
- III. FREEMASONRY IN REALITY.
- IV. JEWISH INFLUENCE IN FREEMASONRY.
- V. ENGLISH FREEMASONRY.

1. Quoted by den Sarda y Salvany : *Le mal social, ses causes, ses remèdes*. Extract from the Bulletin de la grande Loge symbolique écossaise.

FIRST PART

FREEMASONRY IN APPEARANCE

DEFINITION OF FREEMASONRY

Freemasonry varies in appearance according to circumstances, times and peoples. Thus the masonry of Catholic countries is different from that of Protestant countries. Also masonry of to-day differs from that of before 1789 and from that of the middle of the nineteenth century. Everywhere and always it offers diversities and contradictions.

In principle, and according to its statutes, Freemasonry is a secret association, the aim of which is philanthropic, humanitarian and progressive. It wishes to ennoble and perfect society by directing it towards an ideal of light, progress, and truth.

All virtues are practised, above all those of tolerance and brotherly solidarity between masons. It is a sublime, holy and sacred institution, the everlasting originator of all things done in humanity which are good, beautiful, and great. This association aims to place itself above the ideas of party, class, nationality and religion. All freemasons are brothers and equals. In the original statutes freemasonry must keep apart from politics. From the religious point of view each mason is free to believe what he wishes.

These declarations are found, or have been found, in the constitutions of all the masonic federations and therefore carry authority.

What at first strikes a layman is the vagueness of the formulas : what is the light ? what is an ideal of progress ? Every one can have a different conception of it. That is just what masonry wants, for it can thus work in the most varied directions. Only two affirmations remain definite : no dealing in politics and respect for every religious faith.

We shall see that the facts ceaselessly contradict these two dogmas. In France for example freemasonry no longer hides itself and carries on openly a religious and political struggle.

ORIGINS OF FREEMASONRY

If we are to believe the contradictory versions which masons give of their origins they are both vague and manifold. It seems that the association dates from very ancient times. In England it comes from the guilds of mason builders of the middle ages. Historically it may be stated that freemasonry has existed in its present form since 1717. At that time several English lodges met in London and founded the *Grand Lodge of England*, the first in date of all the grand lodges of the world. John Anderson was entrusted with the task of bringing together, correcting and editing in a definitive form the masonic constitutions. His work appeared in 1723 and served as a basis for all present masonic constitutions ¹.

1. Detailed information is given by the two following authors : W. J. Hughan, *Constitutions of the freemasons of the first grand Lodge of England*. London, 1899, and W. Begemann, *Vorgeschichte und Anfänge der Freimaurerei in England*, Berlin, 1909.

ORGANISATION OF FREEMASONRY

There is a double and simultaneous organization : the visible administrative organization and the hidden organization sometimes unknown to freemasons themselves.

The apparent administrative organization.

The freemasonry of the whole world is divided into several groups administratively independant of each other, each group corresponding broadly to a country. They bear different names such as : Federation of the Grand Lodge of England, of the Grand Orient of France, etc... The administrative organization of each of these groups or federations is very much the same everywhere.

Let us take the Grand Orient of France for example. It comprised before the war about 20.000 members distributed in 400 lodges of about 50 members each ¹.

Each lodge is directed by officers elected for one year. They are five in number : the venerable, the first and second overseers, the speaker and the secretary. They have no authority outside their lodge.

The central authority of the social body is also appointed by election. Each lodge elects a delegate, and these delegates meet twice a year. The assembly thus formed is called a « Convent » and is in fact the masonic parliament of the Federation.

This « Convent » elects 33 members appointed for three years to form the council of the order, which is the executive committee of the whole federation.

At the head of the council is a board and at the head

1. In all there are about 50.000 masons in France actually.

of the board is a President or chairman. (In other federations this president is called Grand Master.) The President, or Grand Master, is therefore at the head of a masonic federative administration, which is not as important a function as one might believe.

The convent examines questions of masonic general interest, deals with the budget, decides upon modifications in the statutes, maintains intercourse with other federations and, at present, occupies itself above all with political and religious questions.

Secret organization of the Degrees.

So much for the visible organization ; but according to an ex-mason, Copin Albancelli, there exists simultaneously another which is much more secret — that of the Degrees. We shall only touch on it briefly and return to it later. When a person enters freemasonry, he first of all belongs to an apprentice lodge and is received as an apprentice. At the end of a certain time, when his mind is judged to be sufficiently receptive for the masonic light, he passes to the degree of companion that is to say he is admitted into a lodge of companions. After a further period of observation, more or less prolonged, and if he is judged satisfactory, the companion will be promoted master and join a master's lodge. Every mason can visit a foreign lodge of a degree similar or inferior to his own. Each degree has a catechism, ritual and symbols of its own.

Here let us note a difference : In the open administrative organization, the chief officers are appointed by election, whilst in the organization of degrees they are chosen by selection. The masons of a higher degree observe their brothers of a lower degree, and only admit among them those whom they select.

Another particularity is that, whilst a mason is nomin-

ated definitively to any degree which he may attain, an election in the administrative organization is always temporary. The degrees of companion, apprentice and master form the lower masonry or blue masonry, from which it is possible to resign at will. Above this comes the masonry of high Degrees whose activity is unknown to the members of blue masonry. The number of high Degrees varies according to the federations and rites. In the Grand Orient of France only eight are actually practised ; the best known being those of Rose-croix, chevalier kadosch, etc. The Scottish Rite practised at the Grand Lodge has kept the thirty three degrees. The supreme councils of the Scottish Rite of the whole world are confederated. The thirty-third Degrees of the Grand Orient are not admitted to them.

Higher up, the degrees continue to be given by selection, the number of members diminishing progressively while the high degrees become very secret.

In a lodge meeting of any degree, there are always present one or more masons of a higher degree, often unknown as such to their brothers of the lower lodges. Every mason is therefore ignorant of what is said and done in the workshops of higher degree than his own, for entrance to them is forbidden. It is an essential duty which is laid upon the higher degrees to visit lower lodges and to inspire in them the ideas which they have themselves received from above.

Freemasonry is then a superposition of Secret Societies. While in the administrative organization the management is directed from below by election, the organization of degrees, on the contrary, demonstrates the probability of a secret higher group which makes its will pass in an invisible manner throughout the whole masonic pyramid. It can readily be understood that documents emanating from higher groups such as those

of the Bavarian Illuminati, of the Haute Vente Romaine and of the Hungarian lodges, throw a strong light on the true nature of the masonic aim and on the means employed. Whoever is at the summit of the pyramid can control the whole structure.

However that may be, whether the secret of masonic organization resides in the arrangement of degrees or elsewhere, one thing is certain, namely that between freemasonry such as it is shown to us in the form of a private humanitarian and philanthropic society and the immense revolutionary part which it has played in the world, there is a striking contrast. There is a similar disproportion between its visible organization and the results obtained. Nor can one understand the need of the terrible oath exacted from all freemasons, an oath accompanied by curses and threats if they should reveal the secrets of the association. Would a simple philanthropic society make such serious dispositions and think of such precautionary measures ? When it is only a question of doing good, even discreetly, there is no need for this kind of concealment : there is something behind the facade.

Let us therefore inquire into the part played by freemasonry in history and as shown in its documents from Munich, Rome, Buda-Pesth, and it will then appear to us such as it is really : an essentially revolutionary power.

I shall not speak of rites, of symbols and of the ceremonies necessary for the creation in the lodges of the desired state of mind for the propagation of masonic ideas. Each degree has its ceremonies, its rituals, its catechisms and its psalms. All that is without interest for the layman. We shall only say a few words on a very important point : the religion of secrecy which masonry

has created. At each degree the oath to maintain secrecy is renewed and the punishments which await the unfaithful mason are recalled.

The following is an example of such oaths :

If I should in the very least degree violate my oath, may my head be cut off, my heart, my teeth and my entrails be torn out and thrown into the sea, may my body be burnt and the ashes cast to the winds so that nothing may remain of me or of my thoughts among men and among my brother masons.

Masonry is so well organized in this respect and knows so well how to render its adherents secretive that not a word leaks out, even in the low degrees which know nothing important and which form the immense majority. There is to my knowledge no case of a high initiate having betrayed an important secret.

SECOND PART

THE
REVOLUTIONARY PART OF FREEMASONRY
IN THE WORLD

FREEMASONRY AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1789

None of the great classical histories of the Revolution mentions the part played in it by freemasonry. It is indeed incomprehensible : Here is the greatest event of history for 1800 years, an event which has changed the face of the world ; a hidden power plays in it an immense part and this power remains unknown for more than a century ! A few persons have known the truth and either from fear or from interest have kept silent. Others, still fewer in number, have spoken and have been treated as visionaries. Many sincere people have felt that the revolutionary manifestations of 1789 were not entirely spontaneous. They had a presentiment of a secret-impulsion without being able to discover its source.

But to-day freemasonry openly acknowledges the French revolution as its work.

In the chamber of Deputies during the sitting of 1 July 1904 the Marquis de Rosambo pronounced the following words :

Freemasonry has worked in a hidden but constant manner to prepare the revolution.

Mr Jumel. — That is indeed what we boast of.

Mr Alexandre Zévaès. — That is the greatest praise you can give it.

Mr Henri Michel. — That is the reason why you and your friends hate it.

Mr de Rosambo. — We are then in complete agreement on the point that freemasonry was the only author of the revolution, and the applause which I receive from the Left, and to which I am little accustomed proves, gentlemen, that you acknowledge with me that it was masonry which made the French revolution.

Mr Jumel. — We do more than acknowledge it, we proclaim it ¹.

It was from 1772 to 1789 that masonry elaborated the great revolution which was to change the face of the world. It was then that the masons gave to the people the ideas which they had adopted in their lodges ².

Masonry which prepared the revolution of 1789 is in duty bound to continue its work ; the present state of opinion invites it to do so ³.

From 1789 freemasonry wished to found a new civilization radically opposed to the old order. It was necessary to overthrow that which constituted the strength of the latter : The monarchy and catholicism

1. Passage quoted in the *Conjuration anti-chrétienne* by Mgr Henri Delassus.

2. Report read at an assembly of the lodges *Paix et union* and *la libre conscience*. Orient of Nantes, 23 April 1883.

3. Circular sent to all lodges by the grand council of the masonic order to prepare the centenary of 1789. These last two quotations are given in *La conjuration anti-chrétienne* by Mgr H. Delassus. Vol. I, p. 146.

These two bases destroyed, social order is without defence, and the former discipline and hierarchy can be abolished at leisure. As they cannot enter into open warfare against the church, the masons attack its natural supports, monarchy and aristocracy. The inner meaning of this warfare is not only political, but essentially social and religious, for western civilization is founded upon christian ideas and discipline.

The abolition of monarchy by Divine Right was the condition sine qua non of the entire scheme. It was impossible to attempt anything against society under this form of government. The Revolution, which, we are told, was made for the people, was in reality made against the people. The monarchy and aristocracy were not destroyed because they were oppressing France but because, on the contrary, they protected it too well.

Such a plan may seem too improbable.

And yet it has been exposed in detail and in writing by the hand of Weishaupt, head of the masonic sect of the « Illuminati », long before 1789. These irrefutable documents which were seized in the very headquarters of « Illuminism » by the Bavarian government could be seen in the Munich archives ¹.

The practical application of that plan which was made between 1789 and 1793 is moreover a guarantee of its authenticity.

1. These documents have been partly reproduced by abbé Barruel in his book : *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme*, 1798, and more recently by Mgr Delassus in his work : *La conjuration anti-chrétienne*, 1910. See also Le Forestier : *Les Illuminés de Bavière*, 1914, and N. H. Webster : *The World Revolution*, 1922.

IDEAS AS WEAPONS OF DESTRUCTION

The extraordinary skilfulness of the hidden masonic power consisted in making France work for its own destruction and in using the people to overthrow everything which really protected them. Lying and hypocrisy have been the characteristics of all revolutionary movements in the world since 1789 up to our time. One thing is said whilst the contrary is being deliberately done.

« One must lie like the devil, » said Voltaire, « not timidly, not for a time only, but boldly and always » (Letter to The-riot).

The general principle according to Collot d'Herbois is that : *Everything is permitted for the triumph of the Revolution.*

This secret power directing the attack knew that certain ideas, lofty and beautiful in appearance, could prove a terrible weapon of destruction. It had, moreover, at its service the real genius of the formula ; provided that the telling phrase, full of high sounding words and fine promises, is spoken to the masses, that is the principal thing ; the contrary of what has been stated can be done afterwards, that is of no importance. Such are the three words of masonic origin : Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

We may sum up by saying that the Revolution of 1789 was not a movement of revolt against the « Tyranny » of the old system of government, nor, as we are asked to believe, a spontaneous, sincere, [and enthusiastic soaring towards new ideas of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Freemasonry was the hidden

inspiration, and to some extent the directing influence of the movement. It did not create from the beginning the new social gospel, whose earlier origin dates from the Reformation, but it elaborated the principles of 1789, spread them among the masses and contributed actively towards their realization.

Let us study the details.

THE REVOLUTIONARY PART OF FREEMASONRY FROM 1789 TO 1792

Every one knows the revolutionary preparation of the « Encyclopédistes ». What is not known is the preponderant part played by masonry during the revolution. The following is the evidence of the mason Bonnet, orator of the Convent du Grand Orient de France in 1904.

During the 18th century the glorious line of the « Encyclopédistes » found in our temples a fervent audience, which, alone at that period, invoked the radiant motto, still unknown to the people, of « Liberty, Equality, Fraternity ». The revolutionary seed germinated rapidly in that select company. Our illustrious brother masons d'Alembert, Diderot, Helvetius, d'Holbach, Voltaire and Condorcet, completed the evolution of people's minds and prepared the way for a new age. And when the Bastille fell, freemasonry had the supreme honour to present to humanity the charter which it had friendly elaborated.

It was our brother mason Lafayette, who was the first to bring forward the proposal for a « declaration of the natural rights of man and of the citizen living in society », in order to make it the first chapter of the constitution.

On August 25th 1789, the Constituent Assembly, of which more than 300 members were masons, finally adopted, almost word for word, such as it had been for long elaborated in

the lodges, the text of the immortal declaration of the Rights of Man.

At that decisive hour for civilization, French masonry was the universal conscience, and in the various projects improvised and initiated by the members of the Constituent Assembly, it never ceased to apply the considered results of the slow elaborations of its workshops.

The above assertion is so clear and explicit that it needs no further commentary.

Amongst the documents which demonstrate the masonic revolutionary preparation those of the « Illuminati » are the most complete.

We have noted the circumstances in which the Bavarian government seized in Munich on 11th october 1786 the archives of the Illuminati. The leader Weishaupt succeeded in escaping. A plan of world revolution was found. [All the documents were put together under the title : *Ecrits originaux de l'ordre et de la secte des Illuminés*, and published by A. François, court printer. Munich 1787].

The soul of the association was its chief Weishaupt. Louis Blanc who was a sufficiently pure revolutionary for his words not to be doubted, has in his *Histoire de la Révolution*, thus characterized his work :

To bring under one will and to animate with a single spirit thousands of men in every country of the world, but first of all in Germany and in France, by the attraction of mystery alone, the only power of the association ; to make these men entirely new beings by means of a slow and gradual education ; to render them obedient to the point of madness, even to death itself, to their invisible and unknown chiefs ; with such a legion to exercise secretly pressure on the minds of men, to surround sovereigns, to direct governments all unknown by them, and to guide Europe to the point that all superstition [read:religion] should be abolished, all monar-

chies overthrown, all privileges of birth declared unjust, even the right of property done away with : such was the gigantic plan of Illuminism.

To pass from preparation to action requireset a work of organization and concentration. A masonic European congress was held for this purpose at Wilhelmsbad, near Frankfurt, in 1781. The Illuminati played a preponderant part. The lines to be followed were decided upon and, among other things, the deaths of Louis XVI and Gustavus III of Sweden were discussed.

We have private evidence of this from the count von Haugwitz, the comte de Virieu, the Reverend Father Abel, etc. Count von Haugwitz who was Prussian minister at the congress of Verona in 1822, read a memorandum there, in which he admitted having been a mason and intrusted with arrangements of masonic meetings in various countries :

In 1777 I undertook the direction of lodges in Prussia, Poland and Russia. From what I learnt while carrying out these functions, I have since acquired the firm conviction that all which has happened in France since 1788, the French revolution and the assassination of the king with all the attendant horrors, was not only decided upon at the time, but that it had all been prepared by meetings, instructions, oaths and signs which left no doubt as to the identity of the brains which arranged and directed everything.

The comte de Virieu had been a delegate at Wilhelmsbad representing the masonic lodge « Les chevaliers bienfaisants » of Lyon. Upon his return to Paris, dismayed by what he has learnt, he declared :

I shall not tell you the secrets which I have brought back, but what I believe, I may tell you, is that a plot is being

hatched, so well contrived and so deep that it will be difficult for religion and for the government not to succumb.

The Reverend Father Abel, son of the Minister of Bavaria, gave an address in Vienna in 1898, in the course of which he made the following statement :

In 1784 there was an extraordinary meeting at Frankfurt of the « Grande Loge Eclectique ». One of the members put to the vote the condemnation to death of Louis XVI, king of France, and of Gustavus III king of Sweden. That man was called Abel, he was my grandfather.

A Jewish newspaper, *Die neue freie Presse*, having reproached the speaker with casting a slur on his family, Father Abel said in his following address :

My father's dying wish was that I should devote myself to repair the harm which he and our relatives had done. If I had not to carry out this injunction of my father's will, dated 31 July 1870 I should not speak as I am doing ¹.

Having elaborated its plan of action, freemasonry actively began to carry it out, by directing by invisible means the electoral campaign of 1789. M.M. Cochin and Charpentier in a work called : *La campagne électorale de 1789 en Bourgogne*, give as their conclusion that in view of the state of disorganization of the old independent bodies — provinces, orders and corporations — it was an easy matter for an organized party to seize upon public opinion and direct it. M.M. Copin-Albancelli in his book : *Le pouvoir occulte contre la France*, analyses the writings of M.M. Cochin and Charpentier. This is what he says :

1. These two passages are quoted from Mgr Delassus : *La conjuration anti-chrétienne*.

These two writers have examined the documents of municipal and national archives for 1788-1789. For example they specially applied themselves to a study of the electoral campaign of 1789 in the province of Burgundy.

They verified that the principal demands contained in the « cahiers » of this province were composed not by the States, nor by the provincial corporations, but by a very small minority, a little group of a dozen members, mainly doctors and lawyers. Not only did this group compose the proposals, but it manœuvred to get them accepted by each of the corporations ; it used tricks and subterfuges to gain its ends, and, if it did not succeed, falsified the text of adopted resolutions. This is not all. They verified also that in the documents emanating from this group which was working in Burgundy, a jargon is employed which we now know well as that of masonry. And finally so that their demonstration should be complete, the two authors, extending their work, found the same procedure used in other provinces, the same very small minorities everywhere composed of similar elements, acting everywhere at the same time and in the same way, and consequently obeying the same order and password, and speaking the same jargon which is so easily recognized, thus proving that this pass-word was transmitted by freemasonry. So true is this, write M.M. Cochin and Charpentier that there was not a single movement termed popular from 1787 to 1795 — except that in La Vendée — which really was so ; that all of them were decided, organized and planned in all their details by the chiefs of a secret organization, acting everywhere at the same time and in the same manner, and causing the same order to be executed everywhere.

On the rôle of freemasonry in the preparation of the Revolution the recent and remarkably documented work of the mason G. Martin provides a clear and abundant proof ¹.

1. G. Martin : *La Franc-maçonnerie française et la préparation de la révolution*. Les presses universitaires de France, Paris, 1925.

G. Martin accuses all the adversaries of freemasonry of bad faith, and that cuts short all argument. He says :

Freemasonry is not subversive. It respects king, religion and law... but its obedience is not passiveness. The laws are worthy of respect but are not intangible (p. 43).

In fact the masons with their enlightened minds await an opportunity to change the laws and propagate principles which destroy them. This is then a dispute over words. The fact upon which everyone is agreed remains :

Freemasonry proclaims and spreads a system of new political, social and religious ideas ; they constitute a different civilization radically opposed to the old one. Freemasonry defines it as superior, therefore masonry is constructive. We, on the contrary, consider it to be bad and dangerous, and, since in order to establish this new civilization it is first of all necessary to destroy the old one, we are therefore justified in saying that freemasonry is destructive.

G. Martin studies the part played by French freemasonry in the preparation of the revolution. This preparation required three phases :

1. *The elaboration of the revolutionary doctrine.*
2. *The propagation of the doctrine.*
3. *The active participation of masonry.*

1. — *The elaboration of the revolutionary doctrine.*

The intimate connection between the Encyclopedists and the freemasons is now well known. Did masonry inspire the philosophers or did it borrow its doctrines from them ?

The freemason Amiable (quoted by G. Martin) opts for the first theory and Martin for the second. The point is therefore not clearly elucidated.

The philosophers had elaborated an abstract doctrine. Freemasonry from 1773 to 1788 brought the doctrine to the point of practical application, a work which Martin thus summarizes :

In this manner the doctrine which was to be that of the States General emerged, little by little. The masons of St-Brieuc were right in saying that it was wholly from the philosophers, while those of Rennes were not wrong in affirming that it was masonry, nevertheless, which made it the instrument of political and social emancipation that it was in process of becoming (p. 97).

In order that this doctrine should have a political import, two conditions were necessary.

1. The adhesion of the majority of the nation to its postulates.

2. Sufficient strength to surmount the obstacles, which those whose interests it would injure, would not fail to place in its way. Masonry was usefully employed in assisting these conditions.

In order to bring about the adhesion of the majority of the nation it organized propaganda ; to insure sufficient strength it took a very intimate part in the elections. At the same time it tried to disarm the ill-wills of rivals (p. 98).

The propaganda was first of all carried out in the masonic circles with the following result :

The fundamental principles of masonry ended by becoming an integral part of the mentality of all masons, not only an acquired philosophic idea, but a way of feeling, and often also a way of being (p. 120).

The foundation in 1773 of the *Grand Orient* and the reorganisation of the *Loge des neuf sœurs* (to which Voltaire belonged) mark the beginning of a new phase : propaganda outside the lodges.

One may divide into three categories the methods of propaganda employed by freemasonry in order to spread in the profane world the reforming truths with which it desired to imbue it : The press, oral propaganda, the didactic spirit of the club (p. 126).

The balance-sheet of masonry in the domain of ideas properly so called may be thus established :

1. Masonry has been the best instrument of propaganda and diffusion of philosophic ideas.

2. If it did not create the doctrines of reform, it nevertheless elaborated them.

3. Masonry in the transformation of society through ideas, did not content itself with adopting principles from individuals ; it very soon came to see practical means of realizing its ideas... It has been on this account the real creator not of the principles, but of the practice of revolution.

4. Finally, apart from this rôle, masonry also proves itself the great propagandist of the modern gospel.

Therefore :

Masonry indeed bore, almost in spite of itself, the weight of this constituent revolution. It had, in fact, not only preached its doctrines but also prepared the leaders, and, imprudently perhaps, propped up certain practices derived from the old system, whose application soon got beyond its control and gave warning of the days of August and September 1792 (p. 145).

2. — *The Propagation of the Doctrine.*

Freemasonry directed the elections of March-April 1789.

They were, in many points, its work, which it is of interest to examine in detail.

Freemasonry was a primordial influence in the composition of the cahiers of 1789.

The identity of editorship strikes even the least critical mind... people consequently wished to discover whether the cahiers had not some models which were circulated from baillage to baillage.

This research soon led to the discovery that instructions or general models of the cahiers, had been everywhere distributed. and,

We cannot fail to be struck by the fact that *all these instructions*¹ are of masonic origin. The result was that the half of the deputies elected to the States General in 1789 were freemasons.

G. Martin summarizes their influence as follows :

In the « tiers-Etat » a group was formed which masonry supported, how and by what means we shall presently see. This group had in its favour its cohesion, a very clear understanding of its plan, the practice of parliamentary debates, and, at the beginning, an almost perfect discipline.

It represented nearly half the assembly and the great majority of the order. But it would have been fated to im-

1. Italicized in the original text.

tence if it had kept to the old manner of voting by order. It acted then upon the deputies of the other orders, who were impressed by its cohesion and its will, and, thanks to the masonic elements among them, was able to detach them between the 5th May and the 22nd June. It thus assured the surrender of the king and the triumph of the reforms.

It is difficult in these circumstances, to overestimate the services rendered by freemasonry to the beginning of the revolution.

The elected deputies were indeed strictly supervised, thanks to an organization called « Bureau de correspondance » of which G. Martin gives details :

The freemasons did not cease in fact to direct parliamentary opinion, and the Bureau de correspondance was the point where the connection was made between the masonic lodges, the public, and the elected deputies.

And elsewhere :

Not less important was the financial support brought by masonry to the work of reform. The setting in motion of such an upheaval was bound to cost a great deal, but masonry did not spare its money any more than its time or its intellectual activity.

The masons, indeed, possessed very large capital resources.

The two ways in which it made use of this capital seem, above all, to have been the printing and distribution of pamphlets which served as models for the cahiers, and the equipment of groups of young men who helped towards the triumph of the new ideas.

Freemasonry also gave a great deal in charities, of

which a part had a clearly political aim, or, as we should say to day a demagogic one.

The point achieved is that, in case of trouble, the mob, which will have backed the political demands of the reform party by force, is certain to be supported financially by the masonic lodges (p. 198).

Therefore :

By subsidizing newspapers, by composing public notices, by helping victims of civil war, by financing opposition, masonry brought prudent but effective help to the electoral campaign which led to the convocation of the States General.

And at Versailles also, while the States General was in process of organization, the part played by masonry was again preponderant.

It achieved mastery thanks to the closely organized connection between the mason deputies.

As early as the month of May this plan of a masonic society of representatives became a reality. But it would not do, nevertheless, for it to remain a closed association like a temple, for there would be too great a risk that non-mason deputies would then be tempted to constitute, in opposition to it, a political group which might easily be hostile. It would be enough if the leaders were masons and if the spirit of the club was masonic, so that the principle would be safe and the necessary concentration established (p. 208).

3. — *The active revolutionary Part of Freemasonry.*

This is a dangerous subject and as G. Martin knows that better than any one, he treats it in a much vaguer

fashion. He tells us that freemasonry initiated popular leaders whom it thought it could usefully employ, and, inversely, that it sent masons to harangue the people.

That they were masons was unknown to those whom they harangued. They often cleverly allowed their audience to believe that the initiatives decided upon had come from itself. *They directed but did not force their opinion*¹.

Freemasonry did not content itself with speeches, but organized the proletariat with the aim of maintaining the Order as well as sustaining its principles.

In another sphere the masons, little by little, and thanks to masonic mutual help, invaded the royal government in which they brought about the ascendancy of the ideas of reform. Finally they penetrated into the army.

Freemasonry would have had, perhaps, much more difficulty in securing the triumph of its doctrines in practice, if it had not had, during the last years of the century, the support of a great portion of the army. Historians who have reported this fact seem to have grasped imperfectly the root cause, which was the spread of lodges in military circles...

The old system of government collapsed partly because the French army and its lower cadres did not attempt to come to its aid. Here again masonic propaganda had consequences which surpassed the expectations of its military promoters (p. 274).

... By the help given to the beginning of the Revolution, military masonry was an essential element in the triumph of the new ideas ; it may even be supposed that without it,

1. Italicized in the original text.

the great work would have been seriously compromised (p. 276).

G. Martin who stops at the Revolution properly so called, thus concludes his book.

The importance of masonry in the revolution must not be underestimated. Doubtless the great majority of romantic legends — daggers, traitors and mantles of operatic repertory — have neither foundation nor appearance of truth, and masonry has been right to point out the bad faith of those accusers who collect such childish absurdities. But, these poor and interested falsehoods apart, the fact remains that masonry has been the recognized or hidden soul of all the popular and social movements the sum total of which formed the constituent revolution. Masonry has been the yeast which transformed into creative action the potentialities of emancipation which, without it, would have remained latent or would have miscarried in the lack of coordination and the impotency of spasmodic and divergent efforts (p. 284).

FREEMASONRY AND THE TERROR

Masons, apostles of the great revolution, have succeeded in separating, in public opinion, the immortal principles of 1789 from the excesses of the Terror. Thus they explain the massacres of 1792 as a regrettable fact only due to an over-zealous enthusiasm in the application of the said principles.

Yet freemasonry, a philanthropic and humanitarian association, had a part in the organization of the Terror

We have proofs of its responsibility : those of Bertrand de Molleville, minister of Louis XVI, of the freemason Marmontel and of Duport the author of the revolutionary plan of the Terror, the crimes of which

were prepared mainly by the propaganda committee of the lodge : *Les amis réunis*.

Let us quote the mason Marmontel :

Money, above all, and the hope of pillage are all powerful among this people. We have just experienced it in the faubourg St Antoine, and one could scarcely believe how little it cost the Duc d'Orléans to have the factory of that honest man Reveillon plundered, he who amongst this very people assures the livelihood of a hundred families. Mirabeau jokingly maintains that with a thousand louis one can make a very good occasion for sedition.

Have we got to fear the opposition of the greater part of the nation which does not know our plans and which would not be disposed to lend us support ? Without doubt, in their houses, shops, offices and workshops, the greater part of these home-loving citizens will perhaps think our plans, which may disturb their rest and their pleasures, too daring. But if they disapprove of them it will only be timidly and without noise. Moreover, does the nation know what it wants ? It will be made to wish and to say what it has never thought. If it suspects anything it will receive the same reply as Crispin made to the legatee : That is your lethargy. The nation is a great flock which thinks only of pasture, and which, with the help of good sheepdogs, the shepherds can guide as they will. After all it is their good which we desire, though they knew it not. Neither their old system of government, their religion, their morals, nor all their antiquated prejudices are worth preserving. All that is a shame and reproach to an age like ours ; and in order to trace a new plan a blank sheet is necessary.

To overawe the bourgeoisie, we shall have, if necessary, that class which is resolved and which sees nothing to lose and everything to gain by the change. There are powerful motives to stir it to revolt : scarcity, hunger, money, alarming and terrifying rumours, and the madness of terror and fury which will strike into people's minds.

The bourgeoisie produces only elegant speakers ; all these

orators of the tribune are nothing in comparison with our Demostheneses hired at an *ecu* apiece, who, in the wine-shops, in public places, in the gardens and on the quays, proclaim havoc, fires, villages sacked and running with blood, plots to besiege and starve out Paris.

The social movement requires this. What could one do with all these people by muzzling them with the principles of goodness and justice? Good people are feeble and timid and only the worthless are determined. It is an advantage for the people in a revolution to have no morality. How could they resist men to whom all means are good? There is not one of our old virtues which could help us; the people need not have any, or else they should be of another kind. All that is necessary for the revolution, all that is useful to it, is just; that is the great principle ¹.

Note — 1. — From the beginning of the revolution, freemasonry closed all its lodges. But this apparent suppression was probably only a precautionary measure, for the secret lodges still existed as in the past and all the others were replaced by clubs. Let us not forget moreover that the rôle of freemasonry is to create the revolutionary state of mind rather than to fight openly at the head of the movement. Freemasonry had created the state of mind and sent forward its men to the attack. These were impregnated with the masonic principles and applied them during the revolution without necessarily being directed by freemasonry.

2. — Let us note in passing that Adrien Duport obtained the adoption by the constituent assembly of the emancipation of the Jews. He had attempted to carry this on fourteen occasions before being suc-

1. This passage is quoted from Mgr Jouin's work : *Le Péril judéo-maçonique*.

cessful, and it was only on the eve of the close of the assembly that the law was voted after Regnault de Saint-Jean d'Angely had said : « I demand that all those who speak against this proposal shall be called to order for it is the very constitution which they are opposing » ¹.

Let us now turn to the part played by freemasonry in France from 1793 to our own days.

1. See the detailed history of the emancipation of the Jews in the work of abbé Lemann (a converted jew) : *L'entrée des Israélites dans la société*.

FREEMASONRY IN FRANCE FROM 1793 TO OUR DAYS

The rôle of freemasonry has been exposed in detail and in a complete manner by several writers such as Deschamps, Delassus, Copin-Albancelli, etc., and it is from them that we shall take the following brief summary.

By wishing to go too fast, freemasonry miscarried. The excesses of the Terror brought about a violent reaction of the country. Being unable to do better, freemasonry resumed its philanthropic guise and respectful attitude to social order. It upheld Napoleon, who, moreover, served it by spreading the revolutionary spirit all over Europe. He proclaimed : « I have consecrated the revolution, I have instilled it into the laws » and again : « I have sown liberty broadcast wherever I have implanted my civil code. » In a word he was for Europe what the revolution had been for France. But the secret societies turned against him when he showed a disposition to re-establish for his own benefit an hereditary, stable and conservative autocracy. The first excommunication of freemasonry against Napoleon dates from 1809.

When the Empire fell, the hidden power could not oppose the wish of the whole nation and was obliged to submit to the return of the Bourbons. What masonry wanted, by one means or another, was to save the revolution by maintaining its spirit and keeping as many

of its conquests as possible. The two important points for it were the separation of church and state and the suppression of absolute monarchy. The constitutional form of government was therefore implanted in France, and under it masonry had its chance.

Louis XVIII, said the secretary of the Grand Orient de France Bazot, gave the charter, that is constitutional government. That principle protects us.

Having thus met the most pressing need, the hidden power resumed its work and carried on invisibly a relentless campaign against the Restoration which was becoming too strong and was making the people too contented :

It must be centuries, perhaps, before most peoples of Europe can reach the degree of happiness which France enjoyed under Charles X.

Said Stendhal. — Masonry participated in the revolution of 1830.

Do not believe, said a high mason, the elder M. Dupin of the lodge Trinosophes, that three days have done everything. If the revolution has been so prompt and sudden, if we have made it in a few days, it is because we had a keystone ready to place, and because we have been able to substitute immediately a new and complete order of things for that which had just been destroyed ¹.

I shall not enter into the masonic preparation of the revolution of 1848, as Eckert, Deschamps, Delassus, Copin-Albancelli have devoted several chapters to the subject.

1. Quoted from Mgr Delassus : *La conjuration anti-chrétienne*.

At that time the emancipation of the Jews, begun by the revolution of 1789, spread to the rest of Europe. Troubles broke out almost everywhere in Europe in a simultaneous manner which cannot easily be explained without an international direction. In France on the 6th March 1848 the provisional government, of which 9 out of 11 members were masons, received an official deputation from the lodges with all the panoply of masonic insignia.

They saluted the triumph of their principles and congratulated themselves for being able to say that the whole country has received masonic consecration through the members of the government. Forty thousands masons, distributed in more than five hundred workshops, forming between them but a single heart and mind, were promising their support to achieve the work already begun¹.

In spite of the pressure of this essentially masonic government the elected national Assembly was patriotic ; it refused to obey the guiding lines laid down for it before-hand by the hidden power. The latter without hesitation then turned to a man whom it knew to be its own and Napoleon III ascended the throne.

The Emperor showed that he was indeed the man of the revolution, believing that it was his mission to root it in France and to introduce it everywhere in Europe.

Masonry upheld it as long as it believed that it could count on his obedience. Then the support was withdrawn in proportion as Napoleon tried to lean on France itself in order to regain his independance.

Napoleon III was a strange monarch such as one does not

1. *Le Moniteur*, 7th March 1848, quoted from Mgr Delassus.

often meet in history, nor even among usurpers and upstarts. The latter try generally to make people forget their origins, while he seemed to glory in his, and to have been placed on the throne with the sole object of destroying monarchies, his own finally included..... This Empire might have been taken for a lay republic, and it was, in spite of its deceptive brilliancy, a system of democracy and of free-thought¹.

The disaster of 1870 hastened events and masonry was obliged to intervene sooner than it would have desired. Renewing the attempt of 1789 it sustained the commune. On the 26th April 1871, fifty five lodges, more than ten thousands masons, led by their dignitaries, wearing their insignias, went in procession to the remparts to place banners there to the number of sixty two. At the Hotel de Ville, the mason Tiriforque in saluting the revolutionary power said to the rioters :

The commune is the greatest revolution which the world has been given to behold.

When the Commune was over, the secret societies which had not been able to prevent the election of an assembly with a monarchist majority planned together all over Europe in order to oppose the accession to the throne of the comte de Chambord who represented stable power in legitimacy, heredity and authority.

Freemasonry after having gained as much as it could from the different governments which succeeded each other from 1789 finally reached the form of government which suited it best : that is the Republic under which it is easy for it to seize control.

1. E. Malynsky : *La grande conspiration mondiale*, p. 263, librairie Cervantes, Paris, 1928.

From that time on France has been rolling downwards. The third republic has mostly applied the laws elaborated by freemasonry destroying little by little what remained of the elements of social conservation. Taught by the events of 1789-1830-1848 and 1871 it goes slowly but surely. The monarchy having definitively been brought down, it is a question of overthrowing the other base of the old society, namely catholicism. All the policy of the third republic has been concentrated on this point for fifty years.

Let us quote the words of Gambetta spoken at Romans in 1878 :

The clerical question, that is to say the question of the relations between church and state, takes precedence and holds all other questions in suspense. It is in this question that the spirit of the past takes refuge and entrenches itself. I denounce the ever growing peril which the ultramontane spirit is creating for modern society, that spirit of the Vatican, of the Syllabus, which is only the exploitation of ignorance with a view to a general subjection.

The following quotation is from a speech by M. Viviani delivered from the tribune on 15th January 1901.

We are entrusted with the preservation from all attack of the patrimony of the revolution... We come forward here bearing in our hands, over and above the republican traditions these French traditions attested by centuries of strife, during which, little by little, the laical spirit escaped from the clutches of religious society... We are not only face to face with the congregations but with the catholic church... Above this battle of a day, is it not true that we find once more that formidable conflict in which the spiritual power and the temporal power strive together for the sovereign prerogatives, trying by means of snatching consciences from each other, to keep to the last the guidance of humanity ? But this is

only a skirmish beside the battles of the past and of the future. The truth is that here is an encounter, according to the fine expression of M. de Mun in 1878, between society founded on the will of man and society founded on the will of god.

The question is to know whether, in this battle, a law regarding association will be sufficient. The congregations of the church threaten you not only by their actions but also by the propagation of their faith...

... Do not fear the battle offered to you ; accept it. And if you find in front of you this divine religion which idealizes suffering by promises of future recompense, oppose it with the religion of humanity which also idealizes suffering by offering it, as recompense, the happiness of human generations ¹.

At the masonic convent of 1902 the speaker who made the closing speech said :

This is the last phase of the struggle of the church and its congregations against our republican and laical society. This effort must be the last.

The destructive laws given out by the third republic would be too long to enumerate here ; it is enough if everybody will honestly reflect upon them. If one examines the state of France one naturally comes to the conclusion :

Freemasonry has known how to bring about, without violence, a state of things which is analogous in many points to that of bolshevist Russia, but in a more disguised form.

How has it reached this result ?

The answer is that since 1871 and specially since 1881 none of the governments and cabinets which have

1. This passage and the following are quoted from Mgr Delassus, *op. cit.*

succeeded one another has represented France. The republic, French in name, is nothing but a masonic republic, destructive of true French society and of the church.

In order to reach its aim freemasonry has succeeded in making of our country a centre of revolutionary propaganda.

Freemasonry begins to unmask and everywhere proclaims its victory. As early as 1893 the *Matin* openly stated in one of its articles :

We may affirm, without being overbold, that the majority of the laws which the French submit to — we speak of important political laws — have been examined by freemasonry before appearing in the official gazette. The laws on primary education, on divorce, the military laws and among others the law obliging seminarists to do military service, went from the rue Cadet [headquarters of the G. : O. :] to the Palais Bourbon ; and they came back inviolate and definitive.

In conclusion comes this shout of triumph :

We are still all powerful, but on condition that we compose our aspirations in a simple formula. For ten years we have marched forward repeating : Clericalism is the ennemy ! We have everywhere schools without religious teaching, priests are reduced to silence and seminarists have to carry the soldier's pack. That is no ordinary result in a nation which calls itself the eldest daughter of the church ¹.

The influence of freemasonry in french politics was thus summarized by a well known masonic writer :

The advent of the Republic permitted freemasonry to act outwardly and to take such a place in the State that its

1. This article from the *Matin* is quoted by *La Franc-maçonnerie démasquée*, abbé Tourmentin, Sept. 1893, p. 322-325.

adversaires could say that France was not a republic but a freemasonic State ¹.

The socialist elections of 1924 were the triumph of freemasonry.

The 11th May 1924, the adversaries of freemasonry marked the most complete defeat which they have perhaps ever suffered. This republican victory was characterized, from the masonic point of view, by the fact that there was elected to the chamber of deputies a considerable number of masons whose quality as such was notorious, while the heads of the anti-masonic organizations were ignominiously beaten, as, for example, general de Castelnau in the Aveyron, the Comte de Leusse in the Haut-Rhin, M. Marcellot in the Haute-Marne, etc. ².

The result of these elections was that the interference of freemasonry in parliamentary affairs and its domination on very many deputies and senators became stronger than ever during the Herriot socialist cabinet of 1924.

A. G. Michel has published a book : *La dictature de la Franc-maçonnerie sur la France* (éditions Spes), showing on one side the decisions taken at various masonic congresses, and on the other the corresponding official realizations during the Herriot government.

1. — The lodges decreed the suppression of the embassy to the Vatican (among other sources, the *official bulletin* of the Grande Loge de France, January 1923, p. 39).

1. *Hiram couronné d'épines* by Albert Lantoiné. Paris, E. Nourry, 1926, t. II, p. 513.

2. R. Mennevée. : *L'organisation anti-maçonnique en France*, Paris, 1928, p. 52.

Carried on the 24th October 1924.

2. — The lodges demand the application of the law on the congregations (among others, the *official bulletin* of the Grande Loge de France. Convent of 1922, p. 220).

First ministerial declaration by Herriot, 17th June 1924

3. — The lodges demand the triumph of the idea of laicity (among others, Convent du Grand Orient, 1923, p. 220).

First ministerial declaration by Herriot
17th June 1924.

4. — The lodges demand a full and complete amnesty for condemned persons and traitors, notably Marty, Sadoul, Caillaux, Malvy, Goldsky, etc. (among others, great meeting at the headquarters of the Grand Orient, rue Cadet, 31st January 1923. — *Bulletin hebdomadaire*, n^o 339, 1923, p. 13).

Voted by the chamber, 15th July 1924.

5. — The lodges desire the scrutin d'arrondissement electoral system (among others, Grande Loge de France, 1922, p. 287).

Voted by the senate the 23rd August 1924.

6. — The lodges decree the introduction of the system of non-religious education into Alsace-Lorraine in spite of previous promises (among others. Convent du Grand Orient de France, 1923, p. 265).

Ministerial declaration by Herriot.

7. — The Lodges demand the establishment of the école unique and the monopoly of teaching (Convent du G. O. de France, 1923, p. 265-266).

Ministerial declaration, 17th June 1924.

8. — The lodges wish to reopen relations with the Soviets (*Bulletin officiel* de la Grande Loge de France, October 1922, p. 286).

Realized on 28th October 1924.

9. — The lodges wish to inaugurate an economic system preparing the way for socialism (Convent du G.: O.: de France, 1922, p. 233 and 334).

See A. G. Michel for realizations.

10. — The lodges are for the league of nations to make of it an international tool of freemasonry.

Etc...

The Herriot ministry was the domination of the *Cartel de gauche*.

The cartel

is a coalition, which has existed under various forms for thirty years, of the Radical-socialist party and the collectivist party S. F. I. O. [Section française de l'internationale ouvrière], an alliance concluded in the bosom of freemasonry which is the real master of the republic since 1881.

The radical branch of freemasonry which has dominated, almost alone, for a long time, the great secret organization, has always specialized in the work of undoing christianity in the country by means of anti-religious illuminism...

As for the collectivist party of Blum, the second branch of freemasonry, which tends to supersede the purely radical-socialist branch, its aims are known : it is not only an anti-religious party, but a party of class war and of social revolution, which wishes to destroy what it calls the capitalist system, that is the system of individual ownership, and to replace it by a collectivist or communist society in which the banks, the mines, the factories, the means of transport and the land would be exploited by the proletarian state.

And this S. F. I. O. Party has sent to the present chamber 100 deputies who represent 1.700.000 votes of the 1928 elections.

That is where we are.

But each year which passes increases the danger. Each year which passes the laical school in the hands of a teaching staff, of which three quarters have been won over to the ideas

of the extreme left, throws into public life a fresh contingent of young men who go to swell the revolutionary parties.

Each year which passes a new batch of youths from the free-thinking State schools comes to increase the number of our syndicated civil servants, those who have already begun to sovietize our public services.

Each year which passes, another portion of the popular classes is prevailed upon by « l'Humanité » and the other revolutionary newspapers which can, as we ourselves did in the time of our revolutionary « illuminism » undermine with impunity the foundations of society, under the noses of the authorities.

Finally each year which passes marks a lower birth rate¹.

This Summary of the part played by freemasonry in France from 1789 to the present time is sufficient to enlighten us. We shall now examine the revolutionary action of masonry in different European countries. Being unable to give here a complete history of masonry in Europe we have chosen only a few of the most significant examples.

1. Gustave Hervé : *La Victoire*, n° 4801, 25 février 1929. G. Hervé was for many years one of France's most bitter revolutionaries. The war made him discover his mistake and being a sincere man, he turned round sharply and now leads an active campaign against revolution in his paper : *La Victoire*.

REVOLUTIONARY FREEMASONRY IN EUROPE

PORTUGAL

In Portugal free-thinking, the republic and free-masonry go hand in hand, but of the three, it is masonry which directs. It is, above all, masonry which defends the liberty of thought and spreads the teachings of free-thinking ¹.

At the head of Portuguese masonry was the grand master Magalhaes Lima, a journalist, advocate, politician, free-thinker, republican and revolutionary. He is one of the guiding personalities of universal masonry.

In December 1907 he came to Paris to give in the lodges a series of lectures entitled : *Portugal, the overthrow of the monarchy and the need of a republican form of government*.

Some weeks later king Carlos and his eldest son were assassinated. King Manuel mounted the throne and as he was considered inoffensive his banishment was considered sufficient.

Freemasons did not take the trouble to hide that they were the authors of the Portuguese revolution. The mason Furnemont grand orator of the grand Orient of Belgium, said at the sitting of 12th February 1911 :

1. Raphael Rens in the Bauhütte..., 25 janv. 1909. Quoted from Wichtl : *Weltfreimaurerei, Weltrevolution, Weltrepublik*, München, new edition, 1923.

Do you recall the deep feeling of pride which we all felt at the brief announcement of the Portuguese revolution ?

In a few hours the throne was brought down, the people triumphed and the republic was proclaimed. For those who were not initiated, it was a flash of lightning in a clear sky. But we, my brothers, we understood, we knew the marvellous organisation of our Portuguese brothers, their ceaseless zeal, their uninterrupted work. We possessed the secret of that glorious event ¹.

Quoting this passage, Wichtl adds :

Does one require more proofs ? turn to the *Bundesblatt*, the official organ of the grand Prussian Lodge « *zu den drei weltkügel.* » This paper speaks of a book by the Portuguese professor Georges Grainha on the history of freemasonry in Portugal from 1733 to 1912 and quotes the first words of his preface :

« The majority of outstanding men during the religious, political, and literary upheavals of Portugal during the last two centuries belonged to freemasonry. »

And Dr Grainha adds further on : « All the important leaders of the revolution of 5th October 1910 were masons ². »

Those who worked for the overthrow of the monarchy belonged to the families of Castros, Costas, Cohen, Pereiros, Fereiras, Texeiras, FONSECOS etc which held important posts in Spain, Holland, England, America, and were united by masonry and by *l'Alliance Israélite universelle*.

SPAIN

In Spain as elsewhere, the first aim of freemasonry is the destruction of the Monarchy and of Religion.

1. *Bulletin du G.: O.: de Belgique* 5910, 1910, p. 92.

2. Dr Wichtl : *Work quoted*, p. 102.

The grand master, Morayta, said so clearly at the international masonic congress of Madrid (July 1894).

The people has always followed the policy of the king ; that time has passed and the republic in Spain is a necessary progress which is not far off ¹.

If Alphonse XIII has not been assassinated it is not for lack of trying. We shall, however only speak of the case of Ferrer which is interesting because it shows the world organization of freemasonry ².

On some empty pretext a revolt broke out at Barcelona. Incendiarism and massacres forced the Spanish government to place the town under martial law. The instigator of the troubles Ferrer was arrested. He was handed over to a military court which condemned him to death. The judgment was ratified. Lying telegrams were sent to the newspapers of every country declaring that Ferrer had not been judged according to the law, that his defending counsel had been arrested, and even that the clergy and the Pope had to do with the case. The *Lanterne* wrote : « The bloody hand of the church, a party to the trial, has conducted everything, and the ruffian soldiers of the king of Spain only carry out his will. All the people ought to revolt against this religion of murder and blood. » A caricature followed showing a priest with a dagger in his hand. Threats of reprisals, of the assassination of the king and of the Pope rained down upon Madrid and Rome. Petitions circulated in Paris, Rome, Brussels, London and Berlin to protest against the judgment. Ferrer was executed. Immediately manifestations, some of which were bloody, occurred in the principal towns of France and of several European countries. The zenith was reached

1. Quoted by Dr Brauweiler : *Dreipunkte Bruder*, p. 27.

2. The following passage concerning the Ferrer case is borrowed from Mgr Delassus quoted book. T. I, p. 93, 95, 98, 99.

in a sort of triumph to glorify him in the streets of Paris to the singing of the « internationale ».

Questions were put to the governments in the different parliaments and protests signed by the councils of departments and of communes. Fifty seven towns of France decided to give the name of Ferrer to one of their streets.

The wonderful spontaneity and uniformity of these manifestations for a cause foreign to the interests of the various countries, indicate an organization which reaches all nations and is able to act even in minor localities...

The council of the order of the Grand Orient de Paris sent to all the masonic powers of the world a manifesto protesting against the execution of Ferrer. It claims him as one of his adherents :

« Ferrer was one of us ; he felt that in the masonic work the highest ideal was expressed which man could have to realize. He affirmed our principles until the end. What they wished to strike at in him was the masonic ideal. In the way of the advance towards the limitless progress of humanity an arresting force has appeared of which the principles and the action aim at throwing us back into the night of the middle-ages. »

Freemasonry has then declared by words and deeds that it considered and defended Ferrer as the incarnation of its ideal. We can then through Ferrer know something of this ideal. Here is the summary found in a letter addressed to a friend :

« In order not to scare people and give the government a pretext for closing down my establishments, I call them modern schools and not schools for anarchists. For the aim of my propaganda is, I frankly admit it, to form in my schools convinced anarchists. My wish is to bring the revolution. For the time being one must however be content to implant the idea of a violent upheaval in the minds of the young. They must learn that against the police and the clergy there is only one means of action — bombs and poison. »

The inquiry of the trial led to the discovery, at the villa Germinal, where Ferrer lived, of documents hidden in an

underground room. These documents prove that he had been the leading spirit of the revolutionary movements which had taken place in Spain since 1877.

That is the man whom masonry has presented to the world as professing its ideal.

A few days after the execution of Ferrer, the cabinet in Madrid was obliged to resign, for the heads of the liberal and democratic parties, probably following the influence of the lodges, notified senor Maura, the prime minister, that they would make absolute opposition to every measure and every proposal which he might bring forward. He was obliged to retire and that delighted all the free-thinkers of Europe. The *Acacia*.: wrote :

Is there not a great duel taking place throughout the world between Religion and Free-thought, between autocracy and democracy, between absolutism and revolution? Has the church frontiers and the Vatican a native country? Is not the drama of humanity being played by the international forces of the convent and the school? The fall of the Maura cabinet, also the execution of Ferrer will only have been episodes in this great and ceaseless drama.

ITALY ¹

« The revolutionary attempts which have occurred since 1821 in Italy were the work of freemasonry » said the mason Chiossone at a meeting which was held in 1907 at the Parisian lodge « Solidarity ».

It was about that period that Mazzini began his revolutionary activity of which the principal aims were the liberation, the unity and the republicanization

1. The chapters concerning Italy and Turkey have been taken from Wichtl already quoted book *Weltfreimaurerei*, etc., 10th edition. p. 95-107.

of Italy, the suppression of the temporal power of the Pope, the destruction of Austria and the establishment of republics everywhere.

« He was in contact with the revolutionaries of the whole world such as Kossuth, the Polish revolutionary Stanislas Vorcell, and the Russian Jew Alexander Herzen who were all three masons. It was not then without reason that twenty two years after his death the Rivista della Massoneria Italiana said of him and his assistants : « Mazzini, Garibaldi and Kossuth shine with unsurpassed glory which make crowned heads turn pale »...

Was Mazzini a freemason ? He sometimes used hard words in his writings about the hollow symbolism of freemasonry and about the lack of unity in its political programme.

However there is not the least doubt that Mazzini, like Garibaldi, was a mason, although in his political undertakings he relied above all on the secret societies founded by himself and on the Carbonari associations. During his whole life, he maintained the closest intercourse with the best known heads of freemasonry such as Aurelio Saffi, the publisher of his works, and the Jew Adriano Lemmi who was later to restore Italian masonry and turn it in the political direction desired by Mazzini.

Mazzini, and with him Garibaldi, are highly esteemed in masonic papers which praise them both in an exaggerated manner ; the chief organ of the lodges calls them « the greatest stars of Italian masonry »¹. He was grand master from 1871 to 1872 the year of his death. After that his most faithful pupils assumed the direction. It was then that the first council of the order of Italian free-masons was appointed with 33 members.

1. Rivista della Massoneria Italiana, 1891, p. 149.

Under the guidance of the grand master Adriano Lemmi, persona' friend of Mazzini, Italian masonry strengthened its position in 1887. The year 1872 saw the foundation of the unity of Italian masonry, and since then it is guided by the spirit of Mazzini...

Italian masonry has never been else than revolutionary. It exacted from the Italian Government the occupation of Rome and the abolition of the temporal power of the Pope.

Very many masons were also among the Irredentists who were openly supported by the lodges and the masonic papers.

Mazzini and Garibaldi remained until their death revolutionaries and republicans. Their revolutionary programme has been relentlessly applied by Italian freemasons who awaited the favourable moment to execute the last item : the ruin of the Austrian catholic monarchy.

TURKEY

In 1900 the Grand Orient of France began to turn its attention to Turkey. The young Turks, who were for the most part composed of Jews, Greeks and Armenians were making no progress in their political efforts. They found help in masonry and thereafter advanced rapidly.

« A Secret Young Turk council was formed and the whole movement was directed from Salonica. Salonica was the most Jewish town in Europe — 70.000 Jews out of a population of 100.000 — was specially suitable for the purpose. It already contained moreover several lodges in which the revolutionaries could work without being disturbed. These lodges are under the protection of European diplomacy and as the Sultan

was without weapons against them his fall was inevitable ».

This extract from the *Acacia* (October 1908) explains everything. At Salonica there were at that time two lodges which were connected with the Grand Orient of Italy. The lodge « Macedonia », whose venerable was the Italian Jew Emmanuel Carasso, and the lodge « Labor et Lux ». There were also the lodge « Veritas » which was connected with the Grand Orient of France, the Spanish lodge « Perseveranza » and the Greek lodge « Philippos » this last one pursuing an exclusively national policy.

The young Turks entered these lodges and met there in order to organize and prepare the revolution. Moreover a great number of the members of the lodges strengthened the secret young Turk « Committee of Union and Progress », in which they carried out valuable work. The Turkish government, which could not long remain in ignorance of this constant and mysterious work, became alarmed but its police was unable to get to the bottom of the plot. As a precaution, the lodges turned to the Grand Orient of Italy which let them foresee the protection of the Italian embassy in case of need. Thus little by little the young Turk party came to be almost entirely composed of freemasons, among whom Jews occupied the most influential posts.

The revolution having succeeded as we know, freemasonry knew how to utilize its victory. On the 1st May 1909 the representatives of forty five Turkish lodges met in Constantinople and founded the « Grand Orient ottoman ». Mahmoud orphi Pasha was nominated grand master. Among the other dignitaries were the following « Turks » : David Cohen, Raphaelo Ricci, Nicolas Forte, Marchione, Jacques Souhami, Georges Sursock.

A short time after a « Supreme council of the ancient and accepted Scottish Rite » was also formed and recognized by the French and Italian masonic authorities.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

It would take too long to relate the part played by freemasonry in the modern revolutions of Serbia, Greece, Germany and elsewhere. We shall only speak of its action in Hungary, a very interesting country from this point of view because, following upon the bolshevist revolution of Bela Kun, the government seized and published the masonic archives, thus exposing their flagrant connexion with the revolutionary movement.

On the 29th of April 1918 the grand Master of Hungarian masonry, Dr Arpad Bokay, made a very patriotic speech in Vienna.

The enemies of Hungary are also the enemies of Austria ; those who are in league to destroy Austria wish to do the same for Hungary ; it is the monarchy which, in the tempest of the world war, has protected the peoples of Austria-Hungary in the most efficacious manner, etc.

In November of the same year the imperial government was overthrown, and on the first page of the first Number of its bulletin which was now able to appear without hindrance¹, Viennese masonry thus hailed this event :

1. Freemasonry which was conditionally authorized in Hungary was prohibited in Austria, which however did not prevent its existence and work in that country under cover of certain precautions.

The new state of things came as a surprise. All at once we had become free republicans, masters of ourselves. We were no longer the slaves and martyrs of a bureaucratic government that without critic or resistance served militarism and self-domination ¹.

For his part Dr Arpad Bokay, grand Master of Hungarian Masonry made a significant speech on the 2^d November 1918 of which the following extracts have been copied in the Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung (the revolutionary government of Karolyi had just been formed).

The masonic programme (which he had just described) is also the programme of the national Hungarian council and of the popular government which has just been formed.

Our way is thus made clear to us.

We are marching shoulder to shoulder with them, we are working with them, we are helping them in their great and heavy, but also thankful task, so that ancient Hungary may without perturbation enter the beloved land of new Hungary which is the most ardent wish of every good patriot.

Our beloved and highly esteemed brothers are working to-day in the first rank, and that entirely reassures us, for we know them and we know that they will carry out in a masonic spirit the work which they have undertaken.

[Note of the W. F. Z. : Six freemasons belonged to the first Hungarian republican government in the capacity of ministers, secretaries of state and under secretaries.] ²

With the arrival in power of Be'la Kun, freemasonry had to face certain difficulties ; by the irony of fate it was then considered as being too *bourgeois* and was distrusted. After the fail of bolshevism the govern-

1. Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung, N° 1/2, May 1919, p. 2.

2. Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung N° 1/2, May 1919, p. 41.

ment dissolved the lodges and published their archives. In their distress the Hungarian masons called upon their brothers all over the world. The masonic newspaper *Latomia* of Leipzig published in March 1922 the following interesting article on these events :

We are able to give the following details concerning the sad fate of freemasons in Hungary from information supplied by one of our Hungarian brothers residing in Nurnberg.

The freemasons, after having again during the war sent an address of welcome to the emperor Francis-Joseph, threw themselves after the catastrophe into the socialist republican idea with the noble persuasion that now the time of accomplishment of the masonic ideal had arrived.

In their writings they made active propaganda in its favour and most of the leaders were masons.

When, after that, Hungary was submerged by the bolshevist wave the men in power soon began to oppress masonry as being a bourgeois institution.

The reaction which, thanks to foreign help, shortly afterwards came back to power was inspired by clerical leadership and also prohibited the lodges, occupied our premises, seized the subscription money and everything found there...

In their distress our Hungarian brothers turned to the North American grand lodges. The result was that, as Hungary was then negotiating a loan in America, the reply was made that this loan could not be considered so long as authorized institutions were not re-established in Hungary ; a clear allusion to prohibition of freemasonry.

Thereupon the Hungarian government saw itself obliged to enter into relations with the ex-grand master. The free resumption of masonic work was proposed to him, on condition that non-masons should have the right of access to the sittings of the lodges. This was naturally refused by the grand master and the loan miscarried¹.

1. *Latomia* of Leipzig n° 2/3, 1922, p. 31.

It is unnecessary to stress the importance of this article for in a few lines it shows us the part played in the Hungarian revolution by freemasonry and by the American government. In this case the latter acted as agent of the American Masonry. That is a serious matter. Where in all this is the famous distinction between Continental and Anglo-Saxon masonry? And we must remember that it is a masonic newspaper which gives us this information and that it is consequently indisputable.

The 1922 September number of the Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung announced from Italy that the grand master Torrigiani promised to intervene at the Geneva conference with the governments of various masonic powers so that they should apply pressure to the Hungarian government. France acted energetically in the same direction. It will remain to the honour of the Hungarian government that it did not yield and faced all these difficulties.

The following is the open letter of the deputy Julius Gömbös addressed on this subject to the Hungarian premier count Paul Teleki :

The royal government of Hungary has, as everyone knows, dissolved Hungarian freemasonry because some of the members of this organisation participated in the preparation of the October revolution and in the work of systematic destruction which took place against the interests of the people and the state of Hungary.

There were among these members, according to the declarations of those who inquired into the matter, men who were amongst us the representatives or agents of the aims of the Jews towards universal domination, and who dreamt in silence to lull to sleep the national sentiment in order to secure the triumph of an anti-national doctrine which is foreign to us, but which is dear to them.

We also know that it was the lodges which undertook the struggle against what is called clericalism, because the strength of the Christian idea and the organisation of Christianity were an obstacle to the realization of their aims.

At the time, the *Move* and, with it, I believe, the greater part of Hungarian Christian society welcomed with joy the ordinance of the government for the suppression of freemasonry, and it is with even greater joy that we have entered the mysteriously arranged apartments of the grand symbolic lodge. We have not the least intention of giving them up again for we should recognize such a relinquishment to be the destruction of our present work for national security.

Considering the past activities of Hungarian masonic organs and their different conception of humanity, neither we, nor I believe the government, can do otherwise than maintain our point of view as to interdiction.

Although the decision regarding the fate of Hungarian freemasonry is a question of internal politics, in my opinion, your Excellency would render a great service to the country by enlightening foreign countries on this question and another which is joined to it, the Jewish question, in order that other countries should not acquire mistaken ideas about the measures which have been taken in view of the protection of religion, of the moral health of the people and of the nation.

The following is a summary of the secret papers found in the lodges of Buda-Pesth ¹.

The book on freemasonry in Hungary which the union of Christian and National councils has just published in Hungary is divided into three parts. The first intitled : *The Crimes of Freemasonry*, by Adorjan Barcsay, contains a great quantity of documents seized when the lodges were dissolved in 1920. The second part written by Joseph Palatinus, is intitled : *The Secrets of a Provincial Lodge*, and exposes like

1. Published in France by Mgr Jouin, *Le péril judéo-maçonique*, t. III, p. 120, translated from Dr Jules Géztesi.

the first the secret masonic work of destruction which led Hungary to the revolution of October 1918 and to communism in 1919. The last part contains the list of the members of the masonic lodges of Hungary, which proves that 90 % of the Hungarian freemasons were Jews.

The three first chapters briefly summarize the general history of the masonic movement. Chapters IV to VIII analyse the working methods of Hungarian freemasons : their struggle against the church and religious teaching in schools, their campaign in favour of universal suffrage, their policy regarding nationalities and their international tendencies. Finally, the last chapters, which attract more specially our attention, show how the Jews grouped in the lodges, systematically prepared defeat and then the destruction which followed upon the end of the war. Chapter XI shows us by means of numerous documents, that in Hungary, freemasonry is eminently a Jewish work ; thus, for example, the book containing the constitution of the grand symbolic Lodge of Hungary, printed at Buda Pesth in 1905, bears the date of the Jewish era 5885. The text of the vows taken by members is in Hebrew. The secret pass-words are in the same language. The list published at the end of the book shows us that 90 % of the members were Jews with names such as Abel, Bloch, Berger, Fuchs, Herz Levy, Pollack, Rosenthal, Schoen, etc. Or Magyarized Jewish names like Hun and Haber. The author of the book quotes on this subject a very characteristic preface which appeared in the work of professor Pierre Agoston (one of the people commissars who shared the power with Bela Kun and who was condemned to death by the Hungarian tribunals last December) a work entitled : The path of the Jews. Among other things one finds the statement that in order to write the history of the Jews in Hungary it is also necessary to write that of Hungarian freemasonry.

Chapter X furnishes the proof that public charity has never been the principal object of Hungarian freemasons as they liked to have people believe. Although they only obtained the recognition of their lodges by the minister of

the interior in 1886 at the express condition that they should not deal in politics, charity was for them only a sign-board behind which were hidden the secret intentions of Jewish freemasons for the gradual monopolizing of all political power.

In a report of 24th February 1911 signed Paul Szende, venerable of the lodge «Martinovics», we find passages such as the following .

« We readily recognize that charity such as we now practise does not correspond with our ideas. We must concentrate our attention on the necessity of achieving radical changes in the actual society ». In 1916 Charles Szalay, grand master of the lodge Comenius, in a speech made to a full assembly acknowledged that : the spirit which animates all true freemasons has always been revolutionary. Works of public charity are not their principal objects, but simply a means towards attaining their final aim.

As regards their part in the communist revolution in Hungary, this work shows that the freemasons worked above all by the press. By patient and tenacious labour they succeeded in gaining power over the majority of the press organs by means of which they sought to destroy the Magyar national sentiment. The daily newspaper *Vilag* was specially responsible for the weakening of discipline in the Hungarian army ; copies of it were distributed by thousands in the trenches.

It was also the Jewish masonic newspapers which always defended the Jewish immigrants from Galicia who ruined the economic life of Hungary by their shameful speculations during the war. They also worked to poison youth in the schools by their anti-patriotic theories. The *Vilag* wrote : « The exaggerated teaching of the Hungarian language and the exaltation of patriotic sentiments by the study of national songs have only

one result — the brutalizing of the children ». And the *Kelet* the official paper of the Hungarian freemasons wrote : « We must win over the teachers and schoolmasters in order to reach, through them, the soul of the young and prepare the way for non-religious instruction. The teachers must be the forerunners of the most advanced ideas. »

Over and above the press and the schools they worked to obtain the greatest possible influence in politics and to hasten the passing of universal suffrage which they knew to be still impracticable in Hungary. As to the attitude of freemasons during the war the author makes it clear by a few quotations.

In 1918 the grand symbolic lodge of Buda Pesth decided unanimously to send to count Michael Karolyi and to the national revolutionary council an address of welcome, declaring that : Hungarian freemasonry will support the new government with all its power. Since it is found to be favourable to the accomplishment of masonic ends. On the 2nd November 1918 the same lodge defined its sentiments thus : « The government actually in power aims at realizing the same ideas as ourselves. Many of our brothers are members of the government, which for us is a guarantee that revolutionary Hungary will follow the path of radical reforms. Our duty is to help it according to our means.

All the Hungarian masonic lodges were dispersed in 1920 and their goods confiscated for the benefit of the state according to the laws of the Hungarian constitution. An inquiry was opened by the ministry of interior in order to know who were the masons directly responsible for anti-constitutional acts and to bring them before the regular tribunals as soon as the inquiry was over.

The Christian societies which formed themselves since the end of the war, all inscribed at the head of their programmes the struggle against freemasons and demanded energetically their prosecution, for Hungarian public opinion held them responsible to a great extent for defeat and above

all for the revolutionary troubles which caused so much harm to Hungary.

In 1920 at the time when the dissolution of the lodges had been decreed in Hungary, M Berthelot, in the name of French freemasonry, addressed a letter to count Albert Apponyi head of the Hungarian peace delegation, requesting him to intervene in order to persuade his government to reconsider its decision. Members of the British diplomatic mission at Buda Pesth and in Vienna made similar applications ; but the government informed them that so long as the part played by freemasons was not entirely cleared up, there could be no question of giving back to them their former privileges.

To conclude let us briefly examine the masonic action during the war.

FREEMASONRY AND THE WAR

Certain authors have asserted that the war of 1914 was in reality a Jewish and Masonic war, perhaps provoked, and in any case utilized by them for the accomplishment of their aims and that they were in fact the great gainers by the peace of Versailles, by the fall of European monarchies, the demoralization of Europe, the destruction of catholic Austria, the transfer to Jewish hands of financial supremacy.

To discuss this opinion is beyond the scope of this study but, although perhaps exaggerated, it has certainly a great part of truth. We will put into the hands of the reader a few masonic documents which ought to enable him to form an opinion.

THE SERAJEVO CRIME AND FREEMASONRY

On the 15th September 1912 the *Revue internationale des Sociétés secrètes*, edited by Monseigneur Jouin, published the following lines :

Perhaps light will be shed one day on these words of a high Swiss freemason on the subject of the Heir to the throne of Austria : « He is a remarkable man ; it is a pity that he is condemned, he will die on the steps of the throne » ¹.

1. *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes*, 8, avenue Portalis. Paris, 15th september 1912, pp. 787-88.

On the 28th June 1914 the Archduke, heir to the crown of the Austrian monarchy, and his wife succumbed to the bullets of Serbian freemasons.

On the 12th October one of the assassins, Cabrinovic unconcernedly said to the judges of the military court: « In freemasonry it is allowed to kill. »

Such are in short the disquieting elements underneath the political crime which let loose the war.

Let us briefly recall the facts.

The Archduke and Archduchess arrived during an official tour at Serajevo, a small town of Bosnia-Herzegovina near the Serbian frontier. They were occupying the back seats in a motor-car, with General Potiorek seated opposite them, and count Harrach beside the chauffeur. The car was proceeding slowly on the Appel quay along the Miljacka river on its way to the town hall. Distributed among the crowd were eight assassins armed with bombs and revolvers, of whom the most resolute were Cabrinovic, Princip and Grabez.

Opposite the Cumurja bridge Cabrinovic threw his bomb. It fell on the car and then rolled to the ground where it exploded, wounding several persons including the occupants of the car immediately following. The Archduke had his car stopped in order to inquire about the wounded, and then the programme arranged upon was continued. When the reception at the town hall was ended, count Harrach placed himself for the return journey standing on the left hand step of the car, so as to protect their Highnesses from an attempt upon them from that side. But on this occasion it came from the right. At the corner of Francis-Joseph street, the car stopped just in front of one of the assassins, Princip, who fired at close range several shots from an automatic.

Neither the Archduke nor his wife moved, but an instant after, the Archduchess collapsed quietly on her husband's shoulder. Count Harrach heard the latter say softly : « Sophie, Sophie, do not die. Live for the sake of our children » he remained quietly seated supporting the archduchess ; a little blood appeared upon his lips, and, to the question of count Harrach, he repeated several times in a weakening voice : « It is nothing, it is nothing. » Then in his turn he lost consciousness. The palace of the governor was reached. The two bodies were quickly carried to a bed on the first floor, but the doctors who rushed immediately in attendance could only declare that death had already taken place.

The drama was at end. It had lasted a few minutes, a few short minutes which were to shake the world.

The crime had germinated in strange minds which M. Kohler thus describes in the preface of the shorthand report of the trial¹.

It was a purely Russian atmosphere which predominated here : nihilist, anarchist and terrorist, in conflict with God and with the world, against all established order. Some positive ideas certainly emerged, such as that of the unification of the Serb and Serbo-Croat populations ; but these ideas were so indefinite and vague that they led to negative conclusions and finally ended in hatred of Austria and in the determination to destroy this great Kingdom. It is a wholly Slav Byzantine psychology which one finds here, violent momentary excitement, dislike of all regular work, alarming mania of destruction, and the poison (of revolutionary propaganda) would never have produced such results in German or Latin brains.

1. Der Prozess gegen die attentäter von Serajevo. Shorthand report of the trial compiled by prof. Pharos. Deckers verlag. Berlin, 1918.

Twenty accused persons appeared on the 12th October 1914 before the military court at Serajevo. Eight were directly concerned in the murder. The four most active participants were Princip, Cabrinovic, Grabez and Illic. All were young men from 18 to 20 years old, mostly students. Princip was a Jew¹.

From the interrogation of the accused it became quite clear that at the beginning none of them knew exactly whom he wished to kill nor why he would kill him. They were all agreed upon killing someone, but whom and why seem to have been quite secondary considerations. In principle they considered that the Slav populations of Austria-Hungary, and especially those of Bosnia, were being oppressed for the benefit of the German and Hungarian populations, and that it was necessary to make an example. In reality it seems from their evidence that the true sentiment which actuated them was hatred of the monarchy; all felt instinctively that the strong personality of the Archduke Franz-Ferdinand barred the way to revolution and a common hatred, uniting these revolutionaries of various and often opposite tendencies, rapidly brought them to agreement.

Some passages of the trial are typical of this.

THE PRESIDENT. — Did you believe that Slavs of southern Austria-Hungary would gain any advantage from your act?

GRABEZ. — I believed that the southern Slavs, who nearly all pay both money taxes and the blood tax, would obtain at least the most essential rights.

1. Illic and two other accused were condemned to death and hanged on the 2nd February 1915. Princip, Cabrinovic and Grabez, being under 20 years old, were sentenced to 20 years imprisonment. The two latter died in prison.

THE PRESIDENT. — What are then in your opinion these most essential rights ?

GRABEZ. — I do not know them very well myself.

THE PRESIDENT. — Then why use empty phrases ? ¹

But as Princip said frankly they were all agreed upon the idea of an assassination.

PRINCIP. — We were agreed upon the choice of means for helping the southern Slavs.

THE PRESIDENT. — What were those means ?

PRINCIP. — Murder ; the disappearance of all those who were opposed to the realization of Pan-Slavia and who are unjust to the people ².

Behind the Narodna, we have vaguely perceived the influence of international freemasonry. Certain passages of the interrogations during the trial brought some light on this point.

CABRINOVIC. — He (Casimirovic) is a freemason, even in some degree one of their chiefs. He travelled abroad immediately (after the men had offered themselves to carry out the assassination). He went to Russia, France and Buda-Pesth. Every time when I asked Ciganovic how far our projects had advanced, he replied that I should know when Casimirovic should return. About this time Ciganovic also told me that the freemasons had already condemned to death the heir to the throne two years ago, but that they had not found men to carry out their judgment. Later when he gave me the automatic revolver and the cartridges, he said :

That man came back last evening from Buda-Pesth. I knew that he had made the journey in connection with our undertaking and that he had conferred abroad with certain circles.

1. Pharos Shorthand report of the trial, p. 46.

2. Idem, p. 32.

THE PRESIDENT. — Are you not simply spinning a yarn ?

CABRINOVIC. — It is the pure truth and a hundred times truer than your Narodna Odbrana documents.

At another part of the trial, the defending counsel Premusic speaking to Cabrinovic, asked the following question : Have you read the books of Rosic ?

CABRINOVIC. — I have read his treatise on freemasonry.

PREMUSIC. — Where these books distributed in Belgrade ?

CABRINOVIC. — I set them in type as a printer.

PREMUSIC. — Tell me, do you believe in God or anything ?

CABRINOVIC. — No.

PREMUSIC. — Are you a mason ?

CABRINOVIC. — (Confused, after a moment's silence and speaking loudly) Why do you ask me that ? I cannot answer you on that subject.

PREMUSIC. — Is Tankosic a mason ?

CABRINOVIC. — (Again after a silence). Yes, and Ciganovic also.

THE PRESIDENT. — From which it follows that you also are a mason, for a freemason never admits to anyone but another mason that he belongs to that society.

CABRINOVIC. — Please do not ask me about that subject for I shall not reply.

There is yet another passage in the trial.

THE PRESIDENT. — Tell me something more about the motives.

Did you know before deciding to attempt the assassination that Tankosic and Ciganovic were freemasons ? Had the fact of you and they being freemasens an influence on your resolve ?

CABRINOVIC. — Yes.

THE PRESIDENT. — Did you receive from them the mission to carry out the assassination ?

CABRINOVIC. — I received from no one the mission to carry out the assassination. Freemasonry had to do with it because it strengthened me in my intention. In freemasonry it is permitted to kill. Ciganovic told me that the freemasons had condemned to death the Archduke Franz Ferdinand more than a year before.

THE PRESIDENT. — Did he tell you that from the very beginning or only after you spoke to him of your wish to carry out the assassination ?

CABRINOVIC. — We had already spoken about freemasonry but he said nothing to me of the condemnation to death before we had quite decided to carry out the assassination¹.

The following passage is from the interrogation of Princip who fired the fatal shots at the Archduke.

THE PRESIDENT. — Did you speak about freemasonry with Ciganovic ?

PRINCIP (insolently). — Why ask me that ?

THE PRESIDENT. — I ask because I must know. Did you speak to him about it or not ?

PRINCIP. — Yes, Ciganovic told me that he was a freemason.

THE PRESIDENT. — When did he tell you that ?

PRINCIP. — He told me when I was asking about the means of carrying out the assassination. He added that he would speak with a certain person and that he would receive the necessary means. On another occasion, he told me that the heir to the throne had been condemned to death in a masonic lodge.

THE PRESIDENT. — And are you also a freemason ?

PRINCIP. — Why that question ? I shall not reply. (After a short silence) : No.

THE PRESIDENT. — Is Cabrinovic a mason ?

1. Pharos Shorthand report, p. 14.

PRINCIP. — I do not know. Perhaps he is. He told me once that he was going to join a lodge ¹.

In the tempest of the war this trial passed unnoticed. The silence of the press was perhaps not entirely due to chance. It was in the interests of many people that there should be silence and there are means to obtain it. But the war is over and since then some curious persons or simply people who love their country, have not been satisfied with the explanations given. Thus recently one of them has brought forward some new light on the subject, and the importance of his personality gives weight to his words. This person is Ludendorff former General Commanding in Chief of the German armies

Here is the translation of the principal passages leaving aside those which are of interest only to the Germans ² :

The freemason Kothner of the grand territorial lodge of Germany, had, on the 28th October 1911 at 11.15 A.-M., a long conversation with the grand master of the order, count Dohna Schledien, in the apartment of the order of this masonic « great power », 12 Eisenacher strasse, Berlin. He spoke to him in the embrasure of the window and, according to his own words, communicated what follows :

« Being, at first, frank and credulous I made some discoveries during the year 1911 in the lodges of other towns abroad, which disturbed me greatly. I came by chance upon proofs that freemasonry was preparing something terrible against Germany. I overheard certain imprudent remarks which gave me a glimpse of the plan to assassinate the Archduke Franz-Ferdinand, of the world war, of the fall of thrones

1. Pharos Shorthand report, p. 33.

2. Ludendorff : *Kriegshetze und Volkermördern*, p. 170 onwards. München, 1928.

and altars, and of all that has since happened ¹.

Upon this terrible discovery I went to the only competent person, the grand master count Dohna Schlodien, and told him what I had heard with my own ears and seen with my own eyes. But he seemed not to hear. This conversation which ought to have led to a decisive rupture with all the grand lodges abroad and some lodges at Rome (these also were part of the fraternal chain of the conspirators against Germany), ended on the categorical reply of the grand master : there is only one freemasonry. »

The Grand territorial lodge of Germany, under the Grand Master Dr Müllendorf, tried by every means to force herr Kothner to retract the admission of this conversation. But his historic declarations shows in a gleam of light to the lay world the crimes and inter-relations of masonry. The mason Kothner has indeed retracted all that he could, except only the above declaration, which he expressly maintained in a letter addressed in the year 1926 to the Grand Master Dr Müllendorf. He stresses that he made a communication to count Dohna, which ought to have given him clear proof that the freemasons of the grand Hungarian recognized Lodge had exercised criminal activity against Germany and against all the peoples.

Regarding the conduct of the mason count Dohna, who, following upon the communication made to him took no steps to inform the government and the German people, the mason Kothner adds that his official grand master count Dohna « protected the Jewish freemasons, was obliged to protect them, held by some international tie unknown to me ».

1. Ludendorff and Kothner see the matter from the German point of view, but as they present it, it is not quite exact. Freemasonry, an international organisation, pursues an international aim, which is in its very essence in contradiction with the national tendencies of every country. This is not specially so for Germany. Freemasonry urged the assassination of Franz Ferdinand not because he was an Austrian-German, but because he was an obstacle to the international revolutionary aim of freemasonry.

The mason Kothner had also entrusted his brother-in-law major Coler, since killed in the war, with the task of transmitting this communication to the general staff of the army. It never reached me.

Elsewhere count Czernin relates in his book : *Im Welt-Kriege. — In the world war* — :

« The Archduke knew quite well that the risk of an attempt on his life was imminent. A year before the war, he informed me that the freemasons had resolved his death. He also told me the town where that decision was said to have been taken. — I have since forgotten it — and mentioned the names of several Hungarian and Austrian politicians who probably knew something about it.

Such are the facts.

It may be said that these predictions were written after the event, that these proofs are from a German and therefore interested source, and that Ludendorff is an « exalté ».

But Ludendorff is not the only one who has spoken. Cabrinovic was not a German, he who said : « In freemasonry it is allowed to kill. And whatever may be said nothing can efface that short sentence written in Paris on the 15th September 1912 : « He is a remarkable man ; it is a pity he is condemned. He will die on the steps of the throne. »

FREEMASONRY AGAINST CENTRAL MONARCHIES

At the international congress of freemasonry at Paris, in April 1917, one of the subjects of the deliberation was : How can a strong movement be provoked in Germany against the monarchy, since the basis of peace must be the deposition of William II and Charles I. All the papers at once expressed this idea in every

shape and form : Peace cannot be concluded before William II and Charles I are deposed.

In his declaration of war the freemason Wilson solemnly announced to the American congress that the war was against the German government only and not against the German people. All this agrees with the line of conduct formulated at the masonic conference at Lisbon the 13th May 1917 by the grand master Magalhaes Lima :

« The victory of the allies must be the triumph of masonic principles »¹.

THE MASONIC WAR

Masonic newspapers said several times that the war was a masonic war having for its aim the triumph of the masonic ideas. According to Wichtl, *the Freemason* contained the following passage :

Already during the first weeks of the war a great masonic meeting held in the United States passed a resolution to give to great Britain and her allies all possible support in the present war (May 1917, p. 601).

The same newspaper said further :

Freemasonry comprises more than two millions members. Every American mason knows very well what that means for the safety and duration of the Republic. The world war is the struggle of democracy against autocracy, and the future of the world will be democratic, whether the German Kaiser knows it or not².

1. Quoted by the Neuer Züricher Nachrichten, n° 206, 1917, see Wichtl, *op. cit.*

2. Quoted by Wichtl, 23rd June 1917, p. 651.

These two quotations coming from a German writer may be accepted cautiously¹ but they are fully corroborated by the following one. A. Lebey, a French masonic authority, said in Paris :

The question is to know which is right, good faith or falsehood, good or evil, liberty or autocracy. The present struggle is the continuation of that which began in 1789 ; one of the two principles must triumph or perish. The very life of the world is at stake. Is humanity able and worthy to live free, or, on the contrary does its destiny condemn it to servitude ?

That is the dilemma which the catastrophe has brought us to solve, and all democrats have given their reply. There is only one way, neither to retreat, nor to come to terms. During a war so clearly defined and so plain, no one can hesitate as to his duty.

*Not to defend the motherland would be to surrender the Republic. Motherland, Republic, the revolutionary spirit and socialism are indissolubly joined*².

It is time then that the rights of peoples should consummate the rights of man, and in the heart of the battle it is indeed the living idea of the free union of human beings which is striving against the dead idea of a feudal, murderous and sterile despotism³.

Towards the end of the war, the revolution in the interior of Germany was being actively prepared. The social democrat Vater, speaking at Magdeburg during a meeting of a workman's and soldier's council made clear the manner in which that preparation was effected :

1. I was unable to get the masonic papers just quoted so could not check the authenticity of the above quotations.

2. Underlined by the author of this book.

3. A. Lebey, *Dans l'atelier maçonnique* (communication from the council of the order, 9th December, 1917), p. 327. Chiron, éditeur, Paris.

Since 25th January 1918 we have methodically prepared the revolution. It was a difficult task and full of danger ; we paid for it by many years of prison. The social democratic party had seen that great strikes do not lead to revolution and that it is necessary to use other means to that end. The labour has brought its fruit. We organized desertions at the front ; we provided the deserters with false papers, money and propaganda leaflets inciting to desertion. We sent our agents in all directions, principally to the front, in order that they might work upon the soldiers and disintegrate the army. They advised soldiers to desert to the enemy and it is thus that the downfall was brought about, little by little, but with certainty ¹.

To sum up then, under the fiery proclamations about the war of Right, of Liberty and of Civilization, the true aim was the overthrow of monarchies, the degradation of the catholic powers and the triumph of the revolution. Now that this triumph seems at hand it is useless to conceal it and Mr Coolidge, late president of the United States of America, publicly recognized it in a speech at Hammond in the 14th June 1927 when he said :

The chief question at stake in this formidable conflict was to decide which form of government was to predominate among the great nations of the world : the autocratic form or the republican form. Victory remained finally on the side of the people. (Reuter-London, 14th june 1927).

1. See ost Deutsche Rundschau Vienna 21st December 1919. Quoted by Wichtl, — see also the memoirs of Ludendorff.

CONCLUSION

WHAT FREEMASONRY REALLY IS.

We have seen what freemasonry is in appearance. Moreover we have seen its revolutionary part in the world. Enlightened by the lesson of the facts and by the masonic documents which we have published we can consequently set forth what masonry really is.

In appearance it is a secret society, philanthropic and humanitarian. In contradiction with this, we have demonstrated the revolutionary work of freemasonry in the world.

We have still to explain the organization of freemasonry and to summarize what freemasonry really is : its origin, aim, methods of procedure, real organization and its directing influences.

ORGANIZATION OF FREEMASONRY

I. — *The origin of Freemasonry.*

Its origin is not definite : it has been connected by some writers with older secret societies as far back as the kabbalist Jews of Egypt¹.

1. See N. H. Webster, *Secret Societies and subversive movements*. Count Lecouteux de Cantelau, *Les sectes et sociétés secrètes*

It is only known to exist with certainty in its present form, from 1717, which is the date of Anderson's constitutions, upon which are based all masonic constitutions.

II. — *Aim of Freemasonry.*

The aim of freemasonry is to change the present civilization, which is essentially Christian, to set in its place a masonic world based on atheist rationalism. The aim of freemasonry has never varied in spite of apparent contradictions in time and place, but it is so vast that it only advances by progressive stages. Each masonic section accomplishes its own part, which is different and even in appearance contradictory according to the times, circumstances, countries and various masonic groups.

Let us say at the beginning that it would be a mistake to believe that all freemasons know explicitly the work in which they are collaborating. This knowledge is not given completely even to the initiates of the high degrees, even to those of the inner lodges. Each one, or rather each group, does the work assigned to them in the appointed place among princes and clergy, politicians and civil servants, journalists and teachers, magistrates and officers and among the masses. But while accomplishing the task imposed on them the individual and the group remain ignorant of the place which the particular work in which they are engaged occupies in the general scheme, for they do not see the entire plan¹.

Thus it was that until the world war freemasonry

politiques et religieuses ; essai sur leur histoire depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la révolution française, 1863.

1. Mgr Delassus, *La conjuration anti-chrétienne.*

was in appearance religious and respectful of established order in certain countries of central Europe. This for two reasons: It would not have been tolerated if it had been openly subversive. Not being able to overthrow the christian world at a single blow, masonry proceeds by degrees, the first consisting in allying itself with protestant countries against the catholic nations which are stronger thanks to the unity of Roman direction. It is already beginning to turn against its former allies in certain countries.

Furthermore the work of duplicity is double: while certain masonic lodges are apparently conservative and respect the established order, behind this camouflage the inner lodges work secretly for the propagation and triumph of revolutionary ideas.

It was thus in France at the eve of the revolution in 1789, in central Europe before the 1918 revolution.

Present civilization is based on Christian principles and so the deeper meaning of the struggle is religious. It is a conflict between God and man lead by reason alone.

M Aulard professor of the history of the revolution at the Sorbonne has said:

It is absurd to continue to say: we do not want to destroy religion, when we are obliged to admit moreover that this destruction is indispensable in order to found rationally the new political and social city. Let us then say no longer: we do not want to destroy religion, let us say on the contrary: we wish to destroy religion in order to establish the new city in its place.

At the international masonic congress held in Paris to celebrate the centenary of the French revolution, the freemason Francolin orator of the Grand Orient spoke thus:

The day will come when among the peoples who have not had a 18th century nor a 1789, monarchies and religions will collapse. That day is not far off, and we are expecting it... that day will bring about the masonic universal fraternity of peoples, the ideal which we set up for ourselves. It is our business to hasten its coming ¹.

It may then be concluded from this that freemasonry and the revolutionary movements have a definite destructive programme, for the realization of which they are straining by every means, not without success, but that their programme of reconstruction is vague and doomed to utter failure.

III. — *The method of procedure of Freemasonry.*

The great task of freemasonry is to spread ideas sometimes noble and beautiful in appearance but in reality destructive, of which the prototype is the famous motto : Liberty, equality, fraternity.

Masonry a vast organism of propaganda acts by slow suggestion, spreading the revolutionary ferment in an insidious manner. The heads sow it among the inner lodges, these transmit it to the lower lodges whence it penetrates into the affiliated institutions ² and into the press, which takes in hand the public.

Tirelessly and during the necessary number of years, the suggestion which is more hidden and imperceptible than an order would be, works upon public opinion and fashions it to wish for the reforms from which

1. International masonic congress of the centenary of 1789-1889, pp. 147-149.

2. Such as la Ligue des droits de l'homme, la Ligue de l'enseignement, le Syndicat des instituteurs, l'Union des combattants républicains, la Fraternelle du cinéma, etc.

nations die. In 1789 and 1848, freemasonry in its momentary command of power, failed in its supreme endeavour. Taught by these experiences, its progress has become slower and surer. When once the revolutionary preparation is obtained and judged sufficient, masonry leaves the field to the militant organizations, Carbonari, bolshevists, or other open or secret societies, and retires into shadows in the background. There it is not compromised; in case of check it seems to have remained apart and is all the better able to continue or take up again its work, like a gnawing worm obscure and destroying.

Before everything a secret society, masonry never works in the full light of day. Every one knows of its existence, its meeting places and of many of its adepts, but one is ignorant of its real aims, its real means, its real leaders. The immense majority of masons themselves are in that position. They are only the blind machinery of the sect which they serve from ambition (politicians or journalists) from self-interest (businessmen, actors), from fanatical conviction ((blind and sincere idealists), or from fear. Many honest masons are so blind that they would be stupefied if they knew for what they are being used. It is secrecy which is the condition of success and masonry holds to it above and before everything, being in this respect wonderfully organized.

IV. — *The hidden masonic organization.*

As far as can be judged, it is double; the administrative organization already described and the hidden organization which is unknown to the great majority of its adepts, everything being done with a view to maintaining secrecy.

Let us recall that when a mason is appointed to a higher degree ;

1° His appointment is final ;

2° He is chosen by the superior group which calls upon him to join it, and is not elected by the suffrages of his equals ;

3° His former lodge companions often remain ignorant of his new dignity, although he continues to mix with them officially.

These three conditions give the solution of this problem which is apparently incomprehensible — that of an invisible power, invisibly transmitting its will and exercising invisibly a dominating influence on French politics.

This water-tight compartment system of degrees makes freemasonry a superposition of secret societies in which each degree knows of the existence and actions of its own group and of those below it, but is ignorant of all that is going on and being decided in the group immediately above it.

A mason is only chosen after having been watched for a long time and judged worthy of elevation : it is not the levelling principle of universal suffrage which operates but the autocratic principle of absolute power. As one advances in the masonic hierarchy the number of high degrees diminishes and thus masonry forms a pyramid of three main stages.

At the base is blue or St John's masonry, a sort of depot where those who will form the higher masonry are examined and chosen, and where they undergo the indispensable masonic moulding ; they also form the necessary contacts with the outer world for the diffusion of masonic ideas.

Above this is the masonry of the high degrees, which, in spite of its name, is only a subordinate masonry, an

indispensable channel to reach the high international freemasonry with probably a small leading inner circle.

It can now be understood how the hidden power is able to transmit its will invisibly in the whole pyramid of masonic workshops. Indeed if two or three members of a superior group, having agreed upon themselves, take part in a meeting of a subordinate group they can easily get their suggestions adopted since their entente is unknown; according to need they will take the necessary time.

It is for this reason that the will is usually transmitted by means of suggestion rather than command, for the latter would risk the discovery and compromising of the immediately superior authority and thereby of the supreme direction.

It is only when the hidden authority believes itself strong enough to be immovable that it gives more definite orders through the medium of freemasonry as is the case in France to-day.

This superposition of secret societies also explains the extraordinary manner in which secrecy is maintained. The hidden power has succeeded in impressing masonic brains with a veritable cult of secrecy. This discipline is imposed with absolute rigour from the very first entrance in freemasonry. It is maintained and renewed at each move upwards. It is recalled to mind again and again although the great majority of masons have no secret to betray. A special state of mind is thus created which explains why those masons who, after long years, reach the really high degrees never betray the order.

For the rest, we know little of high masonry. The Grand Orient and the Grand Lodge of France are lodges of the 1st 2nd and 3rd degree. Above this visible masonry there is another leading from the 4th to the 14th degree,

of which we have the ritual but hardly know anything. We do not know where their meetings take place, how their lodges are named, nor their aims, philosophy and above all we do not know their work. It seems that a new cut is made between the 16th and 17th Degree and that from the latter begins the higher masonry which reaches the 32d degree. It is there in all probability that the higher direction is found and international connection maintained. From the 33rd degree we begin once more to know something of what happens. These are the supreme councils whose importance may be more apparent than real.

Outside of freemasonry proper there are many irregular masonries such as the Illuminati of Weishaupt, the rite of Memphis and of Misraim ; the ordo Templi orientis directed by Aleister Crowley successor of Theodor Reuss. Generally the degrees are priced and can be purchased. There is the universal order of the Bnai Brith. There are great associations which are powerful in wealth and influence such as the Rosicrucians of California. There is the theosophy, linked with masonry, of Mrs Besant who works with the Grand Orient. The adepts of all these societies are often « illuminés », followers of the occult, ill balanced minds, but behind these fools there are people to be taken seriously, such as Rudolph Steiner, whose anthroposophical society is remarkably organized, a mason of considerable worth and much superior to the vulgar anti-clerical of the lower lodges. There are little known sects such as the Ancient Catharres (round Albi and Beziers) connected with the gnostic catholic church with its shockingly cynical ritual [In many occult sects phallic worship is in honour].

In a word there is an extraordinary crop of societies more or less secret and more or less masonic of whose

existence the public is generally totally ignorant, but whose importance is sometimes very real. They all work more or less in the same general direction and their main points have been thus summarized in a book called *the Nameless Order* as corresponding to the six points of the kabbalistic star :

1. *Religious.* -- By philosophy or mysticism or empiric science to undermine and discredit all Christian creed.

2. *Ethical.* -- To corrupt morality of northern races with oriental codes -- weaken marriage bonds --- destroy family life ; abolish inheritance, even heritable names.

3. *Aesthetic.* -- Cult of the ugly and aberrant in art, literature, music and drama --- modernism --- crude orientalism --- degeneracy.

4. *Sociological.* -- Abolition of aristocracy --- creation of plutocracy, money standard --- by vulgar display, extravagance, corruption, to create revolt in proletarian minds, hence class-war.

5. *Industrial and financial.* -- Having destroyed ideals of craftsmanship and pride in handicraft, set up golden serpent of profit. Standardisation of cheap and soddy --- centralization --- cartel and trust leading to abolition of private ownership and to state monopoly.

6. *Political.* -- To kill patriotism and pride of race ; in name of progress and evolution set up internationalism as ideal of human brotherhood. Thus undermine national unity, weaken all governments and so prepare way for their super-government which shall rule the world.

JEWISH INFLUENCE IN FREEMASONRY

What is the directing influence in Freemasonry ?

Many people answer : The Jewish power.

Here we enter upon a forbidden subject on which it is prohibited to touch.

For the Jewish question is closely linked with the masonic question.

At the present time Jews and freemasons are working in collaboration throughout the whole world for the triumph of the universal revolution. The high masonic posts are for the most part held by Jews in various countries ¹.

There are lodges which are exclusively Jewish such as the notorious masonic order of Bnai Brith whose headquarters is in Chicago.

The Jewish spirit dominates masonry and imprints upon it that anti-christian hatred the fierceness of which would otherwise be difficult to explain.

Masonry everywhere upholds and defends Jewish interests.

From whence does this alliance date ?

1. Let us recall that during the important period of the war, Nathan was grand master of Italian masonry and Kohn grand-master of German masonry, to quote two well known names.

THE ORIGIN OF FREEMASONRY AND THE JEWS

Two theories are afoot,

One (the theory of Gougenot des Mousseaux, Copin-Albancelli, etc.) is :

That the Jews have entirely created masonry in order to corrupt the nations of Christian civilization and to propagate behind this veil the general revolution which is to bring about the domination of Israel. It is simply a tool and a means in the hands of the Jews.

In support of this we can quote the article of Dr Isaac M. Wise published in *the Israelit of America* 3rd August 1866 :

Masonry is a Jewish institution, whose history, degrees, charges, passwords and explanations are Jewish from beginning to end ¹.

The other theory (Webster, Wichtl, etc.) is :

Freemasonry was a good and sound institution in principle, but revolutionary agitators, principally Jews, taking advantage of its organization as a secret society, penetrated it little by little.

They have corrupted it and turned it from its moral and philanthropic aim in order to employ it for revolutionary purposes. This would explain why certain parts of freemasonry have remained intact such as English masonry.

In support of this theory we may quote what a Jew, Bernard Lazare has said in his book : *l'antisémitisme* :

What were the relations between the Jews and the secret

1. Quoted from Gregor Shwarz Bostunitch : *die Freimaurerei*, 1928.

societies ? That is not easy to elucidate, for we lack reliable evidence. Obviously they did not dominate in these associations, as the writers, whom I have just mentioned, pretend ; they were not necessarily the soul, the head, the grand master of masonry as Gougenot des Mousseaux affirms. It is certain however that there were Jews in the very cradle of masonry, kabbalist Jews, as some of the rites which have been preserved prove.

It is most probable that, in the years which preceded the French Revolution, they entered the councils of this sect in increasing numbers and founded secret societies themselves. There were Jews with Weishaupt, and Martinez de Pasqualis. a Jew of Portuguese origin, organized numerous groups of illuminati in France and recruited many adepts whom he initiated into the dogma of reinstatement. The martinezist lodges were mystic, while the other masonic orders were rather rationalist ; a fact which permits us to say that the secret societies represented the two sides of Jewish mentality : practical rationalism and pantheism, that pantheism which, although it is a metaphysical reflexion of belief in an only God, yet sometimes leads to kabbalistic teurgy. One could easily show the agreements of these two tendencies, the alliance of Cazotte, of Cagliostro, of Martinez, of Saint Martin, of the comte de St-Germain, of Eckartshausen, with the Encyclopedists and the Jacobins, and the manner in which, in spite of their opposition, they arrived at the same result, the weakening of Christianity. That will once again serve to prove that the Jews could be good agents of the secret societies, because the doctrines of these societies were in agreement with their own doctrines, but not that they were the originators of them ¹.

Both sides bring arguments in support of their respective theories which may be summed up as follows :

1. Bernard Lazare, *l'Antisémitisme*. Paris, Chailley, 1894, p. 342.

FIRST THEORY

Occidental people of Christian civilisation would have been incapable of this creation, for the secret society is the manifestation of an oriental and anti-Christian mentality ; the perfection of masonic organisation proves that its founders had great experiences of secret societies.

The universality of freemasonry, its duration, its finity of aim which can be explained if it is Jewish and serving Jewish interests, becomes incomprehensible if it is of Christian origin.

The very aim of free-masonry : the destruction of Christian civilization, reveals the Jew, for he alone can gain from it, and he alone is actuated by a sufficiently violent hatred against Christianity to be capable of this creation.

SECOND THEORY

The principal argument of its partisans is that history does not show the Jews in the beginning of freemasonry ; that they only appear in it about the first third of the nineteenth century and at that time did not yet play an original part in it¹.

In any case the question has mainly a retrospective interest ; what concerns us is the present result. How it was achieved is a secondary consideration. The actual result is not doubtful. Judeo-masonry is at the head of the revolutionary movement and the pre-

1. Those who are interested in this question can read the studies of Copin Albancelli, Deschamps, Gougenot des Mousseaux, Webster, Jouin, Wichtl, Findel, etc.

ponderence of Jewish influence in freemasonry is for many indisputable. It is demonstrated by reason, by Jewish assertions and by facts.

JEWISH INFLUENCE DEMONSTRATED

I By Reason

The chief argument may be thus summed up :

Freemasonry is a secret society.

It is directed by an international minority.

It has sworn implacable hatred to Christianity.

These three characteristic features are the very ones which characterize Jewry, which would prove that Jews are the directing element of the lodge.

Only the Jews have anything to gain from the aim of masonry.

These occult societies have definitively no other real aim but that of the Judaic associations of which they are only a variant with a semi-Christian physiognomy ; for the thought which directs them is the same, and we knew it before an accident had revealed the correspondence of Nubius with Piccolo-Tigre ; for all their labour is limited to, all their activity applied to and expended in the propagation and hatching out of ideas and facts which must mean the annihilation of the doctrine of Christ in Christian societies. In other words, the sole aim of their efforts is the realization of the triumph of Judaic ideas, proclaimed under the name of « modern principles », by Israel itself, and of which the consequence is the Messianic age which they summon in their prayers ¹.

Arthur Preuss, an American writer, has shown in

1. Gougenot des Mousseaux, *Le Juif, le judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples*. Paris, 1869, p. 341.

his work : *A Study in American Freemasonry*, the close affinities between masonry and the Jewish kabbala. These may be summed up in the following quotation from the celebrated mason Albert Pike :

"All true dogmatical religions come from the Kabbala and lead back to it : all that is scientific and great in the religious dreams of all the illuminated such as Jacob Boehme Swedenborg, St-Martin and others similar is borrowed from the Kabbala. All the masonic associations owe their secrets and symbols to it ¹.

BY JEWISH AFFIRMATION

Let us recall the words of Dr Isaac M. Wise : Freemasonry is a Jewish institution...

The *Jewish world* wrote :

In the face of it how could they (the freemasons) honour king Solomon and reproach one of their own day for having the same blood in his veins as had the king ? Regard for king Solomon, surely should teach them to regard with sympathy all who belong to the nation of which he was the glorious head. We hope that this will tend to put an end to any boycotting of Jews by freemasons. It is strange it should have occurred, seeing how much, as Sir William Raynor hinted, freemasonry owes to what is essentially Jewish ².

Already in 1901 the German mason Findel wrote :

It is less a question of a struggle for the interests of humanity than a struggle for the interests and the domination of judaism. And, in this struggle, judaism reveals itself as

1. Albert Pike, *Morals and dogmas*, pp. 744-745. Quoted by A. Preuss, *Etude sur la franc-maçonnerie américaine*, p. 178.

2. *Jewish World*, *Jews and masonry*, may 22 d 1924.

the dominant power to which freemasonry must submit. Indeed, we should not be astonished by this ; for in a hidden and carefully disguised manner judaism is already in fact the dominating power in many a great lodge of Europe.

So far as Germany is concerned, it must not be forgotten that it is master of the financial and commercial markets, master of the press, both political and masonic, and that millions of Germans are financially its debtors¹.

BY THE FACTS

To show in detail the preponderance of Jewish influence in freemasonry would be to write the history of modern freemasonry and of all recent revolutions. A complete summary of this question would exceed our limits².

Let us recall two recent examples : the bolshevist revolutions in Bavaria and in Hungary. The documents which were thereafter published were seized by the Hungarian government in the archives of the masonic lodges of Buda-Pesth, and their authenticity cannot be doubted. We have already given a summary of them, so it is unnecessary to return to the subject.

We shall see, further on, the part of Judeo-masonry in the bolshevist revolution in Bavaria.

We can then say with all certainty : There is a close alliance between the freemasons and the Jews, and, without our having absolute material [proofs of it which would be difficult to obtain in such a secret

1. J. G. Findel, *die Juden als Freimaurer*, 1901, quoted by A. Rosenberg, *Der Weltkampf*, January 1928, n° 10, München.

2. See among others on this subject the following books : Dr Wichtl, *Weltfreimaurerei*, chapter VIII ; A. Rosenberg, *Verbrechen der Freimaurerei*, chap. IV ; Mgr Jouin, *Le péril judéo-maçonnique*, specially, t. IV.

matter, there is a collection of facts which tend to prove the Jews as being the directing influence in freemasonry.

So in conclusion we may quote this passage from N. H. Webster.

Behind the concrete forces of Revolution, beyond that invisible secret circle which perhaps directs them all, is there not yet another force, still more potent, that must be taken into account? In looking back over the centuries at the dark episodes that have marked the history of the human race from its earliest origins -- strange and horrible cults, waves of Witchcraft, blasphemies and desecrations -- how is it possible to ignore the existence of an occult power at work in the world? Individuals, sects, or races fired with the desire of world domination have provided the fighting forces of destruction. But behind them are the veritable powers of darkness in eternal conflict with the powers of light¹.

1. N. H. Webster, *Secret societies and subversive movements Conclusion*. Boswell, London.

ENGLISH FREEMASONRY

We now come to the great point : Anglo-Saxon and specially English masonry.

One quite understands the difficulty which the normal Englishman feels in crediting the reality of the revolutionary and anti-religious tendencies with which Continental freemasonry stands charged. All or nearly all the masons whom he has personally known have been law abiding citizens, often church goers, often conspicuously charitable and in general pillars of respectability. Speaking of the vast majority of the lodge-members, there is nothing with which they are less in sympathy than subversion of the existing social order, or hostility to any form of sincere religion ¹.

Most of the members and the official heads are above suspicion but we would say this :

Not only are secret societies dangerous, but all societies whose object is mysterious. The whole history of man is proof of this position. In no age or country, has there ever appeared a mysterious association which did not in time become a public nuisance ².

The advantages to be derived from freemasonry are not clearly conspicuous whilst the dangers are obvious,

1. *Freemasonry* by rev. H. Thurston, p. 17.

2. *Proofs of a conspiracy* by Prof. Robison, 4th edition, 1798, p. 466.

one never knows where it tends to and who are the effective leaders. The masonic oath is immoral in principle :

It is imposed by an authority which has no adequate sanction, differing in that respect from the oath exacted for example, by a magistrate, a judge, or an ecclesiastical superior who are in their varying degrees the representatives of the commonwealth or of God. Again, the scope of the oath regards either secrets that are nowadays no secrets at all or else secrets which are criminal and contrary to public polity. Thirdly the manner of the oath taking is irreverent and, in the extravagance of the penalties invoked, it borders on the blasphemous. Fourthly, by the form used the mason may be said to pledge himself blindly to anything and everything, he knows not rightly what. He signs a blank cheque which is left for others to fill in, and though the English apprentice is told beforehand that nothing will be required of him contrary to his allegiance, his country or his conscience, such assurance is worth little when it comes from those whose views on moral questions may be very different from his own¹.

On the other hand we can now speak with the authority of experience; the process has been identical in each country of Europe one after the other : First of all, freemasonry was loyal, conservative and not anti-religious. Behind that veil, the revolutionary anti-Monarchical and anti-Christian work was being carried on in the inner circles, by and by permeating all freemasonry and the outside world. It was thus in France before 1789, in Portugal before 1905, in central Europe before 1918. The masonic documents published at Budapesth are proof of it. What happened in all Europe

1. *Freemasonry*, H. J. Thurston, p. 13.

may possibly befall England too. Would it be an exaggeration to say that this process is now going on in this country ?

There is a hidden power behind that « *Nameless Beast* » (the revolutionary spirit) which is the secret of his amazing achievements ; but it is the very power that the average Englishman refuses to take into account. There are elaborate organisations all over the country for dealing with the red peril, but which of these show a vision sufficiently clear to detect the force behind it, or if detecting, the courage to fight it ? Yet so long as this question is evaded, so long will the Beast continue to march forward and triumph.

From time immemorial the cabalistic Jews have had their great adepts, who have succeeded in their quest for hidden knowledge, and mastered certain secrets of nature ; and who, having thus acquired occult powers, have used those powers for the furtherance of their own political aims. These aims were carried out in the lodges of continental masonry and other secret societies, and we have it on the authority of Disraeli himself that these Jews were found at the head every one of these ¹.

Now as we have already seen, these occult powers were undoubtedly behind the illuminised Grand Orient and the French Revolution ; also behind Babeuf and his direct successors the Bolsheviks.

The existence of these powers has never been questioned on the continent : The catholic church has always recognized the fact, and therefore has forbidden her children under pain of excommunication, to belong to any order of freemasonry or to any other secret society.

But here in England, men are apt to treat the whole thing with contempt, and remind us that, by our own showing, English masonry is a totally different thing from the continental in so far as it taboos the discussion of religion and politics in its lodges.

1. Quoted in *Patriot*, June 9 and July 21, 1927.

That is perfectly true, and no English mason is permitted to attend a lodge meeting of the Grand Orient or of any other irregular masonry. But it is none the less true that Thomas Paine, who was in Paris at the time of the revolution, and played an active part in it, returned to this country and established eight lodges of the Grand Orient and other revolutionary societies ¹.

But that is not all. There are occult societies flourishing in England to-day, such as the Theosophical society, under Mrs Besant, with its order of the Star in the East, and order of the Round Table. Both the latter are, under the leadership of Krishnamurti, vehicles for the manifestation of their Messiah, or World Teacher. These are associated with the continental masons, and claim to be under the direct influence of the grand Masters, or the great white Lodge - Jewish Cabalists.

Co masonry is another branch of Mrs Besant Theosophical society, and in February 1922, the alliance between this and the Grand Orient was celebrated at the grand Temple of the Droit Humain in Paris.

Also the Steinerites « Anthroposophical Society » which is Rosicrucian and linked with continental masonry. Both this and Mrs Besant groups aim at the Grand Orient « united States of Europe ».

But there is another secret society linked to Dr Steiner's movement which claims our attention here : The Stella Matutina. This is a Rosicrucian order of masonry passing as a « high and holy order for spiritual development and the service of humanity », but in reality a « Politico pseudo-religious society of occultists studying the highest practical magic ».

For all this and much more we refer the reader to the series of articles by « Inquire within » which have appeared in the *Patriot*.

And who are those who belong to this Stella Matutina ? English clergymen ! church dignitaries ! one at least of the

1. V. Robison, *Proofs of a Conspiracy*.

above named Red Clergy ! clerical members of a religious community where young men are being trained for the ministry ! The English clergymen and others are doubtless themselves dupes of a directing power, unknown to them, as are its ultimate aims. The Stella Matutina had amongst its members the notorious Aleister Crowley, who, however was expelled from the London order. He is an adept and practises magic in its vilest form. He has an order the O. T. O. which is at the present time luring many to perdition. The *Sunday Express* and other papers have exposed this unblushing villainy.

Then there is another interesting fact which shows the connection between occultism and communism. In July 1889 the International Worker's Congress was held in Paris, Mrs Besant being one of the delegates. Concurrently, the Marxists held their International Congress and Mrs Besant moved, amid great applause, for amalgamation with them. And yet another International Congress was then being held in Paris, to wit, that of the Spiritists. The delegates of these occultists were the guests of the Grand Orient, whose headquarters they occupied at 16, rue Cadet. The president of the Spiritualists was Denis, and he has made it quite clear that the three congresses there came to a mutual understanding, for, in a speech which he afterwards delivered, he said :

The occult Powers are at work among men. Spiritism is a powerful germ which will develop and bring about transformation of laws, ideas and of social forces. It will show its powerful influence on social economy and public life¹.

All this tends to prove that relations between Continental freemasonry and English secret societies including freemasonry are more intimate and extensive than it appears at first.

In an article published in the January-February number of the *Bulletin de la grande Loge de France*

1. *The Nameless Beast* by Chas. H. Rouse, p. 15, 16, 17. Boswell, London, 1928.

concerning the French edition of this book, a well known freemason, Albert Lantoine, mentioning my opinion on this subject added :

The English brothers, and the nation by the way, are shut off from Continental influences, but it will probably be through the Lodges that the penetration of our ideas will be more easily accomplished. Will it be for good ? Will it be for evil ? On this point our opinion differs from that of the author, but for the present it is the fact itself, indicated by Mr de Poncins, which is worth our meditation.

On the other hand what applies to England is not so true for America. We have quoted page 70 the article from the *Latonia* showing the intervention of the United States government in favour of Hungarian freemasonry.

It is commonly reported in central Europe that English masonry made then a move in the same sense. One of the following numbers of the same masonic paper accounts of a German freemason who declared that he had benefited from special treatment once he had made known that he was a mason, when he was prisoner of war in the American army. Similar instances could certainly be multiplied ¹.

When we look back upon some dark page of history, some grave crisis which left its legacy of shame and trouble for long years after, we marvel at the blindness and apathy of the people of that day, at their criminal shirking of a grave responsibility to posterity. Could not they see what was taking place around them ? Could not they realise that

1. On the subject of american freemasonry see the following book : (Arthur Preuss, *A Study in American freemasonry* Herder, St-Louis, U. S. A., 1908.

nothing short of hercic effort and self-sacrifice could save the situation and avert catastrophe ?

But instead of indulging in useless retrospect, suppose we open our eyes to current events, and, noting the danger ahead, stir ourselves to action lest those who came after us shall have cause to marvel, in their turn, that we could amuse ourselves with fiddling while Rome was burning — and so leave them to inherit but the ruins of a once glorious Empire ¹.

1. The Nameless Beast, p. 3.

SECOND PART

JUDAISM

INTRODUCTION TO THE JEWISH QUESTION

The study of revolutionary movements has brought us to Free Masonry ; the study of Free Masonry has led us to the Jews.

The Jewish question is very complex : we shall deal with it as follows :

- I. The statement of the problem.
- II. The revolutionary part played by the Jews in the world.
- III. The organisation of Judaism.
- IV. Conclusion.

THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.

Judaism is intimately connected with the international revolutionary movement which shows itself in various forms throughout the world.

Let us examine then the part of Jewish influence in the modern world in general and particularly in the revolutions of our time.

Insoluble enigma more than two thousand years old the Jewish problem is one of the most formidable which the future lays before us. In order to attempt to solve it, and perhaps again in vain, it is necessary at least to try to become acquainted with its rudiments ¹.

1. G. BATAULT, *Le Problème juif*, p. 37.

Words corroborated by those of a Jew Mr Oscar Levy :

There is no race in the world more enigmatic, more fatal, and therefore more interesting than the Jews.

Every writer, who, like yourself, is oppressed by the aspect of the present and embarrassed by his anxiety for the future, must try to elucidate the Jewish question and its bearing upon our Age.

For the question of the Jews and their influence on the world past and present, cuts to the root of all things and should be discussed by every honest thinker, however bristling with difficulties it is, however complex the subject as well as the individuals of this Race may be.

FIRST PART

THE REVOLUTIONARY PART OF JEWS IN THE WORLD.

JEWS IN MODERN REVOLUTIONS.

Amongst the spectacles to which the 20 th. century invites us must be counted the final settlement of the destiny of European Jews. There is every evidence that, now that they have cast their dice, and crossed their Rubicon, there only remains for them to become masters of Europe or to lose Europe, as they lost Egypt in olden times, when they had placed themselves in a similar position (Nietzsche).

There is a profound antagonism between Jews and non-Jews ; antagonism both spiritual and racial arising from a radically different conception of life, antagonism deeper than is realized by those who see only its outward manifestations.

Scattered and rendered powerless for two thousand years, the Jews have always been bitter revolutionaries, and thus we find them taking part in all modern revolutions of which they are the most active directing element.

The part of the Jews in the French Revolution of 1789 was not evident ; that was perhaps unnecessary : Free Masonry was doing the work and serving as a cloak. We have only a few glimpses of it : the three hundred Masons of the Constituent Assembly struggle with

fierce energy and return to the charge fourteen times in order to obtain for the Jews the right of citizenship ¹.

While studying Free Masonry we have seen the Jew at work in all the secret societies which promote revolutions.

As a general rule where Free Masonry is active, he does not appear, for he does not care to work openly.

From 1848 their influence becomes more and more visible, in European revolutions. The Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Jew Disraeli, declares that it is they who are the promoters of the movement.

the world is governed by very different personages to what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes... That mighty revolution which is at this moment preparing in Germany, and which will be, in fact, a second and greater Reformation, and of which so little is yet known in England, is developing entirely under the auspices of the Jews.

And elsewhere :

One can trace Jewish influence in the last revolutionary explosions in Europe. An insurrection has taken place against traditions, religion and property, the destruction of the semitic principle, the extirpation of the Jewish religion, either under its Mosaic or Christian form, the natural equality of men and the annulment of property are proclaimed by the secret societies which form the provisional government, and men of Jewish race are found at the head of each of them. The People of God cooperate with atheists, the most ardent accumulators of property link themselves with communists. The select and chosen race walks hand in hand with the scum of the lower castes of Europe. And all this because they wish to

1. Abbé LEMANN, *L'entrée des Israélites dans la Société*.

destroy this Christianity which owes them its very name and whose tyranny they can no longer bear.

These words are corroborated by those of Bernard Lazare :

During the second revolutionary period which began in 1830 they showed even more fervour than during the first. They were moreover directly concerned for, in the majority of European states, they did not enjoy full civic rights. Even those among them who were not revolutionaries by reason or by temperament were such by self-interest ; in working for the triumph of liberalism they were working for themselves. There is no doubt that by their gold, their energy, their ability, they supported and assisted the European revolution...

During those years their bankers, their industrial magnates, their poets, their writers, their demagogues, prompted by very different ideas moreover, strove for the same end... we find them taking part in the movement of Young Germany : they were numerous in the secret societies which formed the ranks of the militant revolution, in the masonic lodges, in the groups of Carbonnaria, in the Roman Haute Vente, everywhere, in France, in Germany, in Switzerland, in Austria, in Italy ¹.

It would be too long to follow in detail the part of the Jews in all modern revolutions ; it was particularly apparent in Russia : Free Masonry being forbidden there, they were obliged to carry out the work themselves.

The great revolutionary onset which swept Europe at the end of the War was led by Jews. They were the leaders, their bands were taken from the dregs of the

1. B. LAZARE, *L'Antisémitisme*, p. 341. L. Chailley, Paris, 1894.

working class, eager for plunder, and amongst idealists who allowed themselves to be deceived by their clever propaganda. Like the German Spartacism, Bolshevism in Hungary was a Judaeo-Masonic movement ; official Hungarian documents give irrefutable proofs ¹.

On the 22nd March 1918 the Hungarian Soviet Republic was established ; its heads were Free Masons, e. g. the Minister of Public Instruction, Brother Kunzi (Kohn) ; Brother Jaszi, National Minister of the Soviets, Brother Agoston Peter, Brother Lukazs, son of a Jewish millionaire of Budapesth ; Brother Diener denes zoltan, and above all Brother Bela Kun (Kohn), a criminal of the first order, who still enjoys the special protection of the Austrian government.

The government of the Soviets was composed of Jews. Let us give here the names of the best known so that the memory of them may for long remain : the blood thirsty Tibor Szamuely ², the Prime Minister of the government, Alexander Garbai Joseph Pogany for the army : Ronai (Rosenstengel) for justice :

1. Masonic archives at Budapesth, Mgr. JOUIN, *Le péril judéo maçonnique*, t. III, p. 94 of this book.

2. Szamuely travelled about Hungary in his special train ; an eye witness gives the following description :

This train of death rumbled through the Hungarian night, and where it stopped, men hung from trees, and blood flowed in the streets. Along the railway line one often found naked and mutilated corpses. Szamuely passed sentence of death in the train and those forced to enter it never related what they had seen. Szamuely lived in it constantly, thirty Chinese terrorists watched over his safety ; special executioners accompanied him. The train was composed of two saloon cars, two first class cars reserved for the terrorists and two third class cars reserved for the victims. In the latter the executions took place. The floors were stained with blood. The corpses were thrown from the windows while Szamuely sat at his dainty little writing table, in the saloon car upholstered in pink silk and ornamented with mirrors. A single gesture of his hand dealt out life or death.

C. DE TORMAY, *Le livre proscrit*, p. 204. Paris, 1919.

Varga (Weichzelbaum) for finance ; Vince (Weinstein) as governor of the capital ; Moritz Erdelyi (Eisenstein), Dezso Biro (Bienenstock N° 2) for the police, all Jews, except Garbai.

Elsewhere J. and J. Tharaud wrote :

With him (Bela Kun) twenty six commissaries composed the new government, out of the twenty six commissaries eighteen belonged to Israel. An unheard of proportion if one considers that in Hungary there were altogether 1.500.000 Israelites in a population of 22 millions. Add to this that these eighteen commissaries had in their hands the effective direction of government. The eight Christian commissaries were only confederates.

In a few weeks, Bela Kun and his friends had overthrown in Hungary the age-old order and one saw rising on the banks of the Danube a new Jerusalem issued from the brain of Karl Marx and built by Jewish hands on ancient thoughts.

For hundreds of years through all misfortunes a Messianic dream of an ideal city, where there will be neither rich nor poor, and where perfect justice and equality will reign, has never ceased to haunt the imagination of Israel. In their ghettos filled with the dust of ancient dreams, the uncultured Jews of Galicia persist in watching on moonlight nights in the depths of the sky for some sign precursor of the coming of the Messiah. Trotsky, Bela Kun and the others took up, in their turn, this fabulous dream. But, tired of seeking in heaven this kingdom of God which never comes, they have caused it to descend upon earth.

Experience has shown that their ancient prophets were better inspired in placing it in the clouds ¹.

The testimony of a neutral may be quoted in the following extract from a report on revolutionary activities

1. J. and J. THARAUD, *Quand Israël est roi*, p. 220. Plon Nourrit, Paris, 1921.

published by a committee of the Legislature of New-York, presided over by Senator Lusk :

There was no opposition organized against Bela Kun. Like Lenin he surrounded himself with commissaries having absolute authority. Of the 32 principal commissaries 25 were Jews, a proportion nearly similar to that in Russia. The most important of them formed a Directory of five : Bela Kun alias Kohn, Bela Vaga (Weiss), Joseph Pogany (Schwartz), Sigismond Kunfi (Kunstatter), and another. Other chiefs were Alpari and Szamuely who directed the Red Terror, as well as the executions and tortures of the bourgeoisie.

The same report publishes a list of 76 men prosecuted in America by the Committee as criminal anarchists at the beginning of 1920 and of whom the immense majority bear Jewish names.

The Jewish preponderance in the German revolutions of 1918 is not less irrefutable ; there as elsewhere, they are directors and strategists of the movement. The Soviet Republic of Munich was Jewish ; it is sufficient to mention some other names of leaders : Liebknecht, Rosa Luxembourg, Kurt Eisner and many others !

On the fall of the Imperial Government, the Jews at a single stroke and « en masse » seized the control of the country.

The new German cabinet was dominated by the Jews Haase (Foreign Affairs) and Landeberg. The former had as assistants the Jews Kautski, Alzech who in 1918 was not even a German citizen, and the Jews Kohn and Hertzfeld. The Jew Schiffer was Minister of Finance assisted by Bernstein. The Jew Preuss assisted by the Jew Dr Freund occupied the Secretariat of the Interior.

It was the same in the kingdom of Prussia. The Jew Rosenfeld was at the head of the Ministry of Justice which was entirely staffed by Jews and directed by them.

Hirsch had the Ministry of Interior and Simm was in charge of Finance.

The Jews Lipsinsky and Schwartz were the soul of the Government of Saxony : the Jews Talheimer and Heimann governed in Wurtemberg, Fulda in Hesse.

It is superfluous to recall the part played by the President of the Bavarian Soviet Republic the Jew Kurt Eisner, chief of the Bolshevist Revolution in Munich.

« Eleven small men have made the revolution, said Kurt Eisner in the intoxication of triumph to his colleague the Minister Auer. It seems only just to preserve a lasting memory of these small men ; they are the Jews Max Lowenberg, Dr. Kurt Rosenfeld, Caspar Wollheim, Max Rothschild, Karl Arnold, Kranold, Rosenhek, Birenbaum, Reis and Kaiser.

These ten men with Kurt Eisner van Israelovitch were at the head of the Revolutionary Tribunal of Germany. All the eleven, are Free Masons and belong to the secret Lodge N° 11 which had its abode at Munich N° 51 Briennerstrasse ¹. »

It was the same in nearly all the branches of the German administration : thus the chiefs of police of Berlin, Frankfort, Munich, Essen, were respectively the Jews Ernst, Sinzheimer, Steiner, Levy. The various branches of the soldiers and Workmen's Committees were directed by the Jews Cohen, Stern, Lowenberg, Frankel, Israelovitch, Laubenheim, Seligsohn, Katzstein, Laufenberg, Heimann, Schlesinger, Merz, Weil.

German public opinion accuses them of being the cause of the overthrow of German social order by the spirit of Bolshevism, by the Press, and by Jewish control of the supplies and industry of the country.

So, in face of the violence of public reaction, and, dit would appear, acting on instructions, the Jews abandon-

1. Mgr JOUIN, *op. cit.*, t. I, p. 161.

ned in course of time the principal posts in view in the government, but without relaxing anything of their hold on the real power : Finance, the Press, etc.

Judaism does not care to appear in the full light of day and if it can effectively control government, it willingly allows it to remain in the hands of the nationals of each country. It only enters into a struggle against a nation or a government, when these prevent it controlling and exploiting the country.

Under these circumstances it has boasted of being able to make at will war or peace and of holding in its hands the reins of world power, of being able to make revolution or to restore order. In case of obstinate resistance, it can let loose Bolshevism.

Russia was one of these obstinate cases : hence the Bolshevik Revolution in which the Jewish race appeared at last in the full light of day.

THE JEWS AND BOLSHEVISM

An enormous amount of labour has everywhere been expended in attempting to minimize the part played by Jews in Bolshevism ; unfortunately the facts are there. There is no lack, moreover, of Jewish assertions on the subject ; that these are not generally destined to come to public notice takes away nothing from their value ; on the contrary.

Here are some : the *Jewish World* of the 10 /1 /29 wrote :

This reminds me of what Mentor writing in the *Jewish Chronicle* in the time of the Russian Revolution said on the same subject : — Indeed, in effect, it was the same as what Mr Cox now says.

After showing that Bolshevism by reason of the ruthless tyranny of its adherents was a serious menace to civilization Mentor observed :

Yet none the less, in essence it is the revolt of peoples against the social state, against the evil, the iniquities that were crowned by the cataclysm of the war under which the world groaned for four years. And he continued : « there is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolsheviks, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism, some of which went to form the basis of the last teachings of the founder of Christianity — these are things which the thoughtful Jew will examine carefully ¹.

1. The Ideals of Bolshevism, *Jewish World*, 10th january 1929, n° 2912.

The *Jewish Chronicle* in 1920 published a manifesto by Israel Zangwill an important Jewish writer, in which he exalts the glories of the *race which has produced a Beaconsfield, a Reading, a Montagu, a Kurt Eisner, a Trotsky*. Mr Zangwill in his immense Semitic enthusiasm has brought together in the same category the Jews of the English Government, the Jews of Hungary and the Bolshevist Jews. What is the difference ? All are Jews and all are equally an honour and a benefit to their race.

Rabbi J. L. Magnes, speaking in New York in 1919, pronounced these words :

When the Jew applies his thought, his whole soul to the cause of the workers and the despoiled, of the disinherited of this world, his fundamental quality is that he goes to the root of things. In Germany he becomes a Marx and a Lasalle, a Haas and an Edward Bernstein; in Austria Victor Adler, Friedrich Adler; in Russia, Trotsky. Compare for an instant the present situation in Germany and Russia : the revolution there has liberated creative forces, and admire the quantity of Jews who were there ready for active and immediate service. Revolutionaries, Socialists, Mensheviks, Bolsheviks, Majority or Minority Socialists, whatever name one assigns to them, all are Jews and one finds them as the chiefs or the workers in all revolutionary parties.

M. Cohen, in the *Communist* of Kharkoff of April 1919 has said :

One can say without exaggeration that the great Russian social revolution has been made by the hand of the Jews. Would the sombre, oppressed masses of Russian workmen and peasants have been capable by themselves of throwing off the yoke of the bourgeoisie. No, it was especially the Jews who have led the Russian proletariat to the Dawn of the International and who have not only guided but still guide

to-day the cause of the Soviets which they have preserved in their hands.

We can sleep in peace so long as the commander-in-chief of the Red Army is Comrade Trotsky. It is true that there are no Jews in the Red Army serving as private soldiers, but the committees and Soviet organizations are Jewish. Jews bravely lead to victory the masses of the Russian proletariat.

It is not without reason that in the elections for all the Soviet institutions Jews are in a victorious and crushing majority...

The Jewish symbol which for centuries has struggled against capitalism (Christian) has become that also of the Russian proletariat. One may see it in the adoption of the red five-pointed star which has been for long, as one knows, the symbol of Zionism and Judaism. Behind this emblem marches victory, the death of parasites and of the bourgeoisie...

Elsewhere an English White Book has published the following passage (n° 6. Sir M. Findlay to Mr Balfour, Christiania 17 September, 1918).

I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and, unless as above stated, Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe and the whole world as it is organized and worked by Jews who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things. The only manner in which this danger could be averted would be collective action on the part of all powers ¹.

1. *Russia n° 1. A collection of reports on Bolshevism in Russia presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty, April 1919.*

This passage has been suppressed in the abridged edition of *Parliamentary Paper Russia, n° 1919*. The above quotation is from the Netherlands minister in Russia and was transmitted to Mr (now Lord) Balfour by Sir M. Findlay.

Following upon these affirmative texts let us add some facts :

The complete list of the higher soviet officials has been published in detail, notably by the association.: Unity of Russia 121 East 7th Street New York 1920 :

The question « who governs Russia ? » receives a categorical reply in the simple enumeration of the responsible officials of the irresponsible Soviet government. The data contained in this pamphlet have been carefully taken from the Bolchevist official organs such as *Isvestia Golos Trouda*, the *Red Gazette*, and others... The fundamental fact is incontestable : the Soviet bureaucracy is almost entirely in the hands of Jews and Jewesses, whilst the number of Russians who participate in the Government of the Soviets is ridiculously small. It is impossible to evade this fact, which stands as a solemn warning to countries and states which claim to be Christian and which believe in national modes of existence, in contradiction with the unlimited internationalism in which the Jewish nation is the dominant power.

This list is too long to give in full : the following is a summary : ¹

	MEMBERS.	JEWS.	PERCENTAGE.
Council of Peoples Commissaries.	22	17	77.2
Commissariat of War.....	43	33	76.7
Commissariat of Foreign Affairs	16	13	81.2
Finance	30	24	80.0
Justice	21	20	95.0
Public Instruction	53	42	79.2
Social Assistance.....	6	6	100.0
Labour	8	7	87.5
Bolshevist Red Cross at Vienna, Berlin, Warsaw, Bucarest.....	8	8	100.0

1. This was reproduced in French by Mgr JOUIN, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 109.

Copenhagen			
Provincial Commissaries	23	21	91.0
Journalists	41	41	100.0

Here on the other hand is the list of the high Commissaries of the People (1919).

ALIAS	REAL NAME	
<i>Lenin</i>	Oulianoff,	
	Russian of Jewish	
	mother	
<i>Trotsky</i>	BRONSTEIN	Jew
<i>Stekloff</i>	NACHAMRESS	»
<i>Marloff</i>	ZEDERBAUM	»
<i>Goussicf</i>	PRAPKINE	»
<i>Kameneff</i>	ROSENFELD	»
<i>Soukhanoff</i>	GIMMER	»
<i>Lagovsky</i>	KRACHMANN	»
<i>Bogdanoff</i>	SILBERSTEIN	»
<i>Goreff</i>	GOLDMANN	»
<i>Ouritsky</i>	RADOMISELSKY	»
<i>Voladarsky</i>	KOHN	»
<i>Sverdloff</i>	SVERDLOFF	»
<i>Kamkoff</i>	KATZ	»
<i>Ganetsky</i>	EURSTENBERG	»
<i>Dann</i>	GOUREVITCH	»
<i>Meshkovsky</i>	GOLDBERG	»
<i>Parvus</i>	GELPHANAT	»
<i>Rosanojff</i>	GOLDENBACH	»
<i>Martinojff</i>	ZIMBAR	»
<i>Tchernomorsky</i>	TCHERNOMORDICH	»
<i>Pialnitzky</i>	LEVINE	»
<i>Adramovitch</i>	REIN	»
<i>Lointzeff</i>	BLEICHMANN	»
<i>Zvezditch</i>	FONSTEIN	»
<i>Radek</i>	SOBELSON	»
<i>Litvinof-Wallak</i>	FINKELSTEIN	»
<i>Lunatcharsky</i>	LUNATCHARSKY	Russian

ALIAS	REAL NAME	
<i>Kolontai</i>	KOLONTAI	Russian
<i>Peters</i>	PETERS	Lett
<i>Macklakowsky</i>	ROSENBLUM	Jew
<i>Lapinsky</i>	LEVENSON	»
<i>Vobroff</i>	NATANSON	»
<i>Ostodoks</i>	AKSELRODE	»
<i>Gasine</i>	GERFELDT	»
<i>Glasounoff</i>	SCHULZE	»
<i>Lebedieva</i>	LIMSO	»
<i>Joffe</i>	JOFFE	»
<i>Kamensky</i>	HOFFMANN	»
<i>Naout</i>	GUNSBURG	»
<i>Lagorsky</i>	KRACHMALNIK	»
<i>Isgoeff</i>	GOLDMANN	»
<i>Valdimiroff</i>	FELDMANN	»
<i>Bounakoff</i>	FOUNDAMINSKY	»
<i>Manouilsky</i>	MANOUILSKY	»
<i>Larine</i>	LOURIÉ	»
<i>Krassin</i>	KRASSIN	Russian
<i>Tchitcherin</i>	TCHITCHERIN	»
<i>Goukovsky</i>	GOUKOVSKY	»

In a total of 545 members the Bolshevist administration comprizes.

447	Jews
30	Russians
34	Letts
22	Armenians
12	Germans
3	Finns
2	Poles
1	Georgian
1	Czech
1	Hungarian

These facts are known to everybody : but it is not

known that Western Judaism has supported Bolshevism with solidarity. The funds necessary for the Russian revolution have been supplied by international banks and financiers — we know what this expression means. The following article by Samuel Gompers explains the situation sufficiently well :

I am mindful of the newly adopted policy of the American-Anglo-German Banking group, which perhaps constitutes the most dangerous element in the whole chain of pro-Bolshevist effort in America because it has its hands on the most power.

The truth is that predatory international finance has its appetite up and believes it sees loot in Russia.

I know of nothing more cynical than the attitude of European statesmen and financiers towards the Russian muddle. Essentially it is their purpose, as laid down at Genoa, to place Russia in economic vasselage and give political recognition in exchange. American business is asked to join in that helpless, that miserable and contemptible business, the looting of that vast domain, and to facilitate its efforts, certain American bankers engaged in mortgaging the world are willing to sow among their own people the fiendish, anti democratic propaganda of Bolshevism, subsidizing, buying, intimidating, cajolling. There are splendid and notable exceptions but the great powers of the American-Anglo-German financing combinations have set their faces towards the prize displayed by a people on their knees.. Most important is the espousal of the Bolshevist cause by the group of American-Anglo-German bankers who like to call themselves international financiers to dignify and conceal their true function and limitation. Specifically the most important banker in this group and speaking for this group, born in Germany as it happens, has issued orders to his friends and associates that all must now work for soviet recognition ¹.

Mr Gompers says further :

1. Article by Samuel GOMPERS, *New-York Times*, May 7 1922.

International finance is also accurately represented in the hopes placed in and the moral backing given to the British Labour Party and the Revolutionary international socialism of which it is a member. The 100 per cent socialism of that party in Home Affairs seems unimportant in view of the international program — ideal from the point of view of these cosmopolitan bankers ¹.

The names several times quoted are not those of individuals only working on their own behalf and for whom Jewry would not be held responsible.

Mr Pitt Rivers in his book « The World Significance of the Russian Revolution » is definite on this subject, he says :

It is not unnaturally claimed by Western Jews that Russian Jewry, as a whole, is most bitterly opposed to Bolshevism. Now although there is a great measure of truth in this claim, since the prominent Bolsheviki, who are preponderantly Jewish, do not belong to the orthodox Jewish Church, it is yet possible, without laying one self open to the charge of antisemitism, to point to the obvious fact that Jewry, as a whole, has, consciously or unconsciously, worked for and promoted an international economic, material despotism which, with Puritanism as an ally, has tended in an ever-increasing degree to crush national and spiritual values out of existence and substitute the ugly and deadening machinery of finance and factory. It is also a fact that Jewry, as a whole, strove with every nerve to secure, and heartily approved of, the overthrow of the Russian monarchy, which they regarded as the most formidable obstacle in the path of their ambitions and business pursuits. All this may be admitted, as well as the plea that, individually or collectively, most Jews may heartily detest the Bolshevik régime, yet it is still true that the whole weight of Jewry was in the revolutionary scales against the Czar's

1. *New-York Times*, 31 December 1923. Article reproducing the current issue of the *American Federationalist*.

government. It is true their apostate brethren, who are now riding in the seat of power, may have exceeded their orders ; that is disconcerting, but it does not alter the fact. It may be that the Jews, often the victims of their own idealism, have always been instrumental in bringing about the events they most heartily disapprove of ; that perhaps is the curse of the Wandering Jew¹.

A number of their writers such as Bernard Lazare, Alfred Nossig, Kadmi Kohen, have described this agreement between the two poles of Judaism, international Jewish capitalism and communism.

We find ourselves therefore face to face with this enigma : how to explain that the Jews in general and great Jewish financiers in particular, spread and support everywhere the socialism and bolshevism which are destructive of that capital which is one of their most powerful forces.

The reply is : understandable or not, it is a fact.

It is very evident that they act thus in their own interest and our naïvety probably makes them smile.

Here is what M. Georges Batault says on this subject :

The mode of government which is the most propitious for the full development of the class war, is the demagogic régime which is equally favourable to the two fold intrigues of Finance and Revolution. When this struggle is let loose in a violent form, the leaders of the masses are kings, but money is God : the demagogues are the masters of the passions of the mob, but the financiers are the masters of the demagogues, and it is in the last resort the widely spread riches of the country, rural property, real estate, which, for as long as they last, must pay for the movement.

When the demagogues prosper amongst the ruins of social

W. G. PITT RIVERS. *The World significance of the Russian Revolution*, p. 39, Blackwell, Oxford, 1921.

and political order, and overthrown traditions, gold is the only power which counts, it is the measure of everything ; it can do everything and reigns without hinderance in opposition to all countries, to the detriment of the city, of the nation, or of the empire which are finally ruined.

In doing this do not financiers work against themselves ? it may be asked : in destroying the established order do not they destroy the source of all riches ? This is perhaps true in the end ; but whilst states which count their years by human generations, are obliged in order to insure their existence to conceive and conduct a far-sighted policy in view of a distant future, Finance which gets its living from what is present and tangible, always follows a short-sighted policy, in view of rapid results and success without troubling itself about the morrows of history ¹.

It must never be forgotten that capitalists are of two kinds, proprietors, industrialists and others, generally Christians, and international financiers, principally, though not exclusively, Jews. While social disorder is fatal to the first it furnishes opportunities of profit to the second.

From the strictly financial point of view, the most disastrous events of history, wars or revolutions, never produce catastrophies, the manipulators of money can make profit out of everything provided that they are well-informed beforehand... It is certain that the Jews scattered over the whole surface of the globe are particularly well placed in this respect ².

These have moreover a personal motive for supporting socialism ; one of them, Weininger, has explained for us why so many Jews are communists :

1. G. BATAULT, *Le problème juif*, p. 257.

2. G. BATAULT, *Le problème juif*.

Communism is not only a national belief but it implies the giving up of real property especially of landed property, and the Jews, being international, have never acquired the taste for real property. They prefer money, which is an instrument of power.

This is exactly what has happened in Russia. Property has there been suppressed for the benefit of the state, that is to say, for the profit of the Jew since in fact, the state is Jewish, as it will always be in every socialist state, because of the inherent qualities of the Chosen People.

The so-called dictatorship of the proletariat is in reality the dictatorship of the Jews. They do not wish to destroy capital, but to be the only masters of it.

Collectivism is then neither a popular movement, nor an end in itself, but a means of destruction.

The directors (except a few Jewish fanatics who judge the world with their brain and not with their soul) know better than anybody that the system cannot work : it has been tried several times in the best possible conditions and has rapidly and completely failed ¹.

It can only function in the case of a religious community having abandoned all worldly interest, or in that of nomads living by their flocks in large uninhabited areas. Far from being progress, it is a return to the most primitive form of organization. It is impossible that a modern nation given over to Bolshevism should not die of hunger. We have an example of this in Russia, which before the war was the granary of Europe, now devastated by periodical famines for as long as communism

1. See amongst others, the attempts to apply socialism made by Etienne Cabet and William Lane in Texas and in Paraguay. Webster. *World Revolution*, pp. 114 and 271.

has been applied to its country side. What would conditions be in England or in Germany ?

We are told that socialism is the revolt of the workers oppressed by capitalism : that it is the rising of those who have nothing against those who possess.

In this connection, let us remark, in passing, that all the money is rather on the side of those who have nothing. The anti-revolutionary organizations are indeed constantly hindered by lack of funds whilst this difficulty does not exist for the revolutionary socialist parties which have obviously at their disposal limitless resources.

Socialism is not moreover a popular movement :

The socialist intellectual may write of the beauties of nationalization, of the joy of working for the common good without hope of personal gain : the revolutionary working man sees nothing to attract him in all this. Question him on his ideas of social transformation, and he will generally express himself in favour of some method by which he will acquire something he has not got ; he does not want to see the rich man's motor-car socialized by the state - - he wants to drive about in it himself. The revolutionary working man is thus in reality not a socialist but an anarchist at heart. Nor in some cases is this unnatural. That the man who enjoys none of the good things of life should wish to snatch his share must at least appear comprehensible. What is not comprehensible is that he should wish to renounce all hope of ever possessing anything ¹.

Collectivism (socialism, Bolshevism) is then neither a popular movement nor an end in itself, but a means, an outstanding means of destruction.

The Czarist autocracy was the last material obstacle (there remains still a moral obstacle : Rome and religions

1. N. H. WEBSTER, *Secret Societies and subversive movement*, p. 327.

in general) which barred the way to Jewish imperialism in its conquest of the world ; we have considerable Jewish testimony on the subject.

Russia was the only country in the world in which the directing class opposed an organized resistance to universal Judaism. At the head of the state was an autocrat beyond the reach of parliamentary pressure ; the high officials were independent, rich, and so saturated with religious and political traditions that Jewish capital, with a few rare exceptions, had no influence on them. Jews were not admitted in the services of the state in judiciary functions or in the army. The directing class was independent of Jewish capital because it owned great riches in lands and forest. Russia possessed wheat in abundance and continually renewed her provision of gold from the mines of the Urals and Siberia. The metal supply of the state comprised four thousand million marks without including the accumulated riches of the Imperial family, of the monasteries and of private properties. In spite of her relatively little developed industry, Russia was able to live self-supporting.

All these economic conditions rendered it almost impossible for Russia to be made the slave of international Jewish capital by the means which had succeeded in Western Europe.

If we add moreover that Russia was always the abode of the religious and conservative principles of the world, that, with the aid of her army she had crushed all serious revolutionary movements and that she did not permit any secret political societies on her territory, it will be understood, why world Jewry, was obliged to march to the attack of the Russian Empire ¹.

Russia was an obstacle which Bolshevism has destroyed. In the soviet revolution, the anarchy of the beginning, the pillage, the seizure of lands, was the peculiarly Russian side. This anarchy rapidly gave place

1. Article A. ROSENBERG in the *Weltkampf*, 1st july 1924.

to Jewish organization. To-day the Russians have no longer the right to say anything in their own country. To begin with, the Slav anarchists have been promptly exterminated by the Jewish Bolsheviks. The struggle of Bakunin against Karl Marx, of Anarchy against Communism, was the struggle of two opposite principles and two opposite races : Slavism against Judaism.

Thus one may agree with M. Lokotj, who, as he was a former Russian revolutionary condemned under Czarism, can hardly be accused of possessing a reactionary spirit :

Bolshevism, this symbol of chaos and of the spirit of destruction, is above all an anti-Christian and anti-social conception.

This present destructive tendency is clearly advantageous for only one national and religious entity : Judaism. The fact that Jews are the most active element in present-day revolutions as well as in revolutionary socialism, that they draw to themselves the power forced from the peoples of other nations by revolution, is a fact in itself, independent of the question of knowing if that comes from organized world-wide judaism, from Jewish Free Masonry or by an elementary evolution brought about by Jewish national solidarity and the accumulation of capital in the hands of Jewish bankers.

The contest is becoming more definite. The domination of revolutionary Judaism in Russia and the open support given to this Jewish Bolshevism by Judaism the world over finally clear up the situation, show the cards and put the question of the battle of Christianity against Judaism, of the National State against the International, that is to say, in reality, against Jewish world power¹.

It must not be ignored however that there is an ideology of socialism and that it has only triumphed in Russia thanks to the resolute fanaticism of its pioneers Lenin,

1. *Weltkampf*, july 1924, p. 21.

Trotsky and others. In order to understand Bolshevism clearly, we must not lose sight of the extraordinary medley which characterizes the Jewish mind : on the one hand Messianic fanatical idealism which intends to direct humanity by imposing upon it Jewish ideas, on the other hand a practical judgment, most prudent and most materialistic. To the first we owe international socialism¹ to the second our present economic civilization in which gold is king. Fanaticism explains Bolshevism, the practical business sense explains why Jewish high finance has supported Bolshevism for racial interest ; for the end in view : the domination of the world, is the same for both ; socialism represents the spiritual side, high finance the material side.

The following lines written by a Hungarian lady during the Bolshevik rule well expresses the opinion of those who lived through these tragic hours.

There is little resemblance between the mystical and undecided Slav, the violent but tradition-living Magyar, and the heavy deliberate German. And yet Bolshevism wove the same web over them all, by the same means and with the same tokens. The national temperament of the three races does not the least reveal itself in the terrible conceptions which have been accomplished, in complete agreement, by men of the same mentality in Moscow, Buda Pesth, and Munich.

From the very beginning of the dissolution in Russia, Kerensky was on the spot, then came Trotsky, on watch, in the shadow of Lenin. When Hungary was fainting, weak from loss of blood, Kunfi, Jaszi and Pogany were waiting behind Karolyi, and behind them came Bela Kun and his Staff. And when Bavaria tottered Kurt Eisner was ready to produce the first act of the revolution. In the second act it was Max Lieven (Levy) who proclaimed the Dictatorship

1. Jewish influence in socialism and economic life is examined further on. Cf. p. 157-163.

of the Proletariat at Munich, a further edition of Russian and Hungarian Bolshevism.

So great are the specific differences between the three races that the mysterious similarity of these events cannot be due to any analogy between them, but only to the work of a fourth race living amongst the others but unmingled with them.

Among modern nations with their short memories, the Jewish people is the last representative of ancient oriental civilization. As heir to the Biblical traditions it fervently invokes the hour in which will be realized the great calamities prophesied so many centuries ago. Whether despised or feared it remains an eternal stranger. It comes without invitation and remains even when driven out. It is scattered and yet coherent. It takes up its abode in the very body of the nations. It creates laws beyond and above the laws. It denies the idea of a homeland but it possesses its own homeland which it carries along with it and establishes wherever it goes. It denies the God of other peoples and everywhere rebuilds the temple. It complains of its isolation, and by mysterious channels it links together the parts of the infinite New Jerusalem which covers the whole universe. It has connections and ties everywhere, which explains how capital and the Press, concentrated in its hands, conserve the same designs in every country of the world, and the interests of the race which are identical in Ruthenian villages and in the City of New-York ; if it extols someone he is glorified all over the world, and if it wishes to ruin someone the work of destruction is carried out as if directed by a single hand.

The orders come from the depths of mysterious darkness. That which the Jew jeers at and destroys among other peoples, it fanatically preserves in the bosom of Judaism. If it teaches revolt and anarchy to others, it in itself shows admirable obedience to its invisible guides.

In the time of the Turkish revolution, a Jew said proudly to my father : « It is we who are making it, we, the Young Turks, the Jews ». During the Portuguese revolution, I heard the Marquis de Vasconcellos, Portuguese ambassador at Rome, say, « The Jews and the Free Masons are directing the revolution

in Lisbon. » Today when the greater part of Europe is given up to the revolution, they are everywhere leading the movement, according to a single plan. How did they succeed in concealing this plan which embraced the whole world and which was not the work of a few months or even years ? They used as a screen men of each country, blind, frivolous, venal, froward, or stupid, and who knew nothing. And thus they worked in security, these redoubtable organisers, these sons of an ancient race which knows how to keep a secret. And that is why none of them has betrayed the others ¹.

But the Bolshevist revolution has a deeper meaning. We find in it the dominating idea of all the revolutions since 1789 : the destruction of present day civilization :

The final goal of world revolution is not socialism, or even communism, it is not a change in the present economic system, it is not the destruction of civilisation in a material sense. The revolution desired by the leaders is moral and spiritual, it is an anarchy of ideas in which all the bases established nineteen centuries ago shall be overthrown, all the honoured traditions trodden under foot, and, above all, the Christian ideal finally obliterated ².

It is a struggle between two different conceptions of the world : the Jewish conception, and the Christian conception.

The inward thought of Moscow indeed appears to be that for twenty centuries while humanity has been following Christ, it has been on the wrong road. It is now high time to correct this error of direction by creating a new moral code, a new civilization, founded on quite different principles. And it appears that it is this idea which the communist leaders wished to symbolize when a few months ago they proposed to erect in

1. Cecile DE TORMAY, *Le livre proscrit*, p. 135.

2. WEBSTER, *Secret Societies and subversive Movements*, p. 334.

Moscow a statue to Judas Iscariot, to Judas, this great honest misunderstood man, who hanged himself, not at all, as it is usually and foolishly believed, because of remorse for having sold his master, but because of despair, poor man, at the thought that humanity would pay for by innumerable misfortunes the wrong path which it was about to follow ¹.

Here is a circular of the Communist party which illustrates this point.

In our decrees, it is definitely proclaimed that religion is a question for the private individual ; but whilst opportunists tended to see in these words the meaning that the state would adopt the policy of folded arms, the Marxian revolutionary recognises the duty of the state to lead a most resolute struggle against religion by means of ideological influences on the proletarian masses.

The struggle against God has been led with fierce determination and with blood-thirsty hate, the most degrading means have been employed in it, such as :

The systematic demoralization of young people through teaching, in the schools, the lowest sexual instincts ;

The organized destruction of the family by the abolition of marriage and the socialization of women ;

The massacre of the Russian clergy, the transformation of the Churches into dance-halls and cabarets ;

The spiritual division of the Church by the creation of the Living Church ; etc.

In this sombre tragedy, there are occasional comic interludes.

In 1923, Trotsky, and Lunatcharsky presided over a meeting in Moscow organized by the propaganda section of the Communist party to judge God. Five thousand

1. J. and J. THARAUD, *Causerie sur Israël*, p. 38.

men of the Red Army were present. The accused was found guilty of various ignominious acts and having had the audacity to fail to appear, he was condemned in default ¹.

Bolshevism is then the logical application in Russia of the revolutionary plan which we see developing in the world since 1789. Its essence is the same ; we have only seen up to the present the destructive phase ; this takes different forms according to countries and the circumstances. Bolshevism is the Russian form or to be exact, the form applied to Russia, for it is only Russian in so far as it is taking place in Russia and that they are Russians who suffer from it.

Now that we are beginning to see more clearly what has happened in that unfortunate country, the prophecy contained in the following extract seems all the more impressive. It is from a book by Copin-Albancelli published in 1909. « La conjuration juive contre les peuples. »

There is in existence a plan of world organization about which much has been said for several years past, in favour of which determined propaganda has been made among the masses, and towards which our present rulers are causing us to slide gradually and unconsciously. We mean to say the socialist collectivist organization. It is that which is the most in harmony with the character, the aptitudes and the means of action of the Jewish race ; it is that which bears the signature, the trade-mark of this new reigning people ; it is that which it wishes to impose on the Christian world because it is only by this means that it can dominate the latter.

Instead of wearing a military or political character, the dictatorship imposed by the Jewish race will be a financial industrial, commercial dictatorship. At least for a time, it

1. *Ost Express*, 30th January 1923. Cf. *Berliner Tageblatt* 1st May 1923. See the details of the Bolshevik struggle against religion in *The Assault of Heaven* by A. VALENTINOFF (BOSWELL).

will show itself as little as possible. The Jews have endowed the commercial, industrial and financial world with the Joint-Stock Company, thanks to which they are able to hide their immense riches. They will endow the entire Christian world with that which they have bestowed on France : the Joint-Stock Company for the exploitation of nations called Republic, thanks to which they will be able to hide their kingship.

We are moving then towards the Universal Republic because it is only thus that Jewish financial, industrial and commercial kingship can be established. But under its republican mask this kingship will be infinitely more despotic than any other. It will be exactly that which man has established over the animal. The Jewish race will maintain its hold upon us by our needs. It will rely on a strongly organized and carefully chosen police so generously paid that it will be ready to do anything just as the presidents of republics, who are given twelve hundred thousand francs and who are chosen especially for the purpose, are ready to put their signature to anything. Beyond the police, nothing but workmen on one side, and on the other engineers, directors, administrators. The workers will be all the non-Jews. The engineers, directors and administrators will on the contrary be Jews ; we do not say the Jews and their friends ; we say, the Jews ; for the Jews then will have no more friends. And they will be a hundred times right, in such a situation, to rely only upon those who will be of the « Race ». This may all seem impossible to us ; and nevertheless it will come about in the most natural way in the world, because everything will have been prepared secretly, as the revolution was. In the most natural way in the world, we say, in this sense that there must always be engineers, directors and administrators so that the human flock may work and live and that, furthermore, the reorganization of the world which we shall have disorganized cannot be operated save by those who will have previously gathered in wealth everywhere. By reason of this privileged situation, which we are allowing to become established for their benefit, the Jews alone will be in a position to direct everything. The peoples will put their hand to the wheel to bring about this

state of things, they will collaborate in the destruction of all other power than that of the State as long as they are allowed to believe that the State, this State which possesses all, is themselves. They will not cease to work for their own servitude until the day when the Jews will say to them : « We beg your pardon ! You have not understood. The State, this State which owns everything, is not you, it is us ! » The people then will wish to resist. But it will be too late to prevent it, because all moral forces having ceased to exist, all material forces will have been shattered by that same cause. Sheep do not resist the sheep-dog trained to drive them and possessing strong jaws. All that the working class could do, would be to refuse to work. The Jews are not simpletons enough not to foresee that. They will have provisions for themselves and for their watch-dogs. They will allow famine to subdue resistance. If the need should arise they would have no scruple in hurling on the people, mutinous but unarmed, their police made invincible because they will be provided with the most up-to-date weapons against powerless mobs. Have we not already a vision of the invincibility of organized forces against the crowd.

France has known — and she has not forgotten the rule of the Masonic Terror. She will know, and the world will know with her the rule of the Jewish Terror ¹.

Here are a few details of this Terror in Russia : — First of all the principles of it.

In the beginning the Red Terror was first of all intended to exterminate the Russian Intelligentsia.

The extraordinary Commissions are not a medium of Justice, but « of extermination without mercy » according to the expression of the Central Communist Committee.

The extraordinary Commission is not a « Commission of Enquiry », nor a Court of Justice, nor a Tribunal, it decides

1. COPIN ALBANCELLI, *La conjuration juive contre les peuples*. E. Vitte, Lyon, 1909, p. 450.

for itself its own powers. « It is a medium of combat which operates on the interior front of the Civil War. It does not judge the enemy but exterminates him. It does not pardon those who are on the other side of the barricade, it crushes them. »

It is not difficult to imagine how this extermination without mercy operates in reality when, instead of the « dead code of the laws », there reigns only revolutionary experience and conscience. Conscience is subjective and experience must give place to the pleasure and whims of the judges.

« We are not making war against individuals in particular », writes Latsis ¹ in the Red Terror of November 1918. « We are exterminating the bourgeoisie as a class. Do not look in the enquiry for documents and proofs of what the accused person has done in acts or words against the Soviet Authority. The first question which you must put to him is, to what class does he belong, what are his origin, his education, his instruction, his profession » ².

In fact Communism only maintains itself by a general Terror, and in the end the working and peasant classes have suffered as much as the others. Once launched on the way of massacres, extermination has been carried out at random in order to impose communist rule by general terror. One of the Soviet leaders, who at least possesses the merit of frankness, has dared to write :

Yes, certainly your Russia is dying.

There no longer exists anywhere, if it has ever existed, a single class of the population for which life is harder than in our Soviet paradise... We make experiments on the living body of the people — devil take it — exactly like a first year student working on a corpse of a vagabond which he has procured in the anatomy operating-theatre. Read our two

1. Latsis directed the Terror in the Ukraine.

2. S. P. MELGOUNOV, *La terreur rouge en Russie de 1918 à 1923*. Payot, 1927.

constitutions carefully ; it is there frankly indicated that it is not the Soviet Union nor its parts which interest us, but the struggle against world capital and the universal revolution to which we have always sacrificed everything, to which we are sacrificing the country, to which we are sacrificing ourselves. (It is evident that the sacrifice does not extend to the Zinovieffs).

.
Here, in our country, where we are absolute masters, we fear no one at all.

The country worn out by wars, sickness, death and famine (it is a dangerous but splendid means), no longer dares to make the slightest protest, finding itself under the perpetual menace of the Cheka and the army...

Often we are ourselves surprized by its patience which has become so well-known... there is not, one can be certain in the whole of Russia, a single household in which we have not killed in some manner or other the father, the mother, a brother, a daughter, a son, some near relative or friend. Very well then ! Felix (Djerjinsky) nevertheless walks quietly about Moscow without any guard, even at night... When we remonstrate with him for these walks he contents himself with laughing disdainfully and saying : « What ! they would never dare « psakrer », » and he is right. They do not dare. What a strange country !¹.

Better than any dry statistics the following description by a witness will give an idea of the scale upon which these butcheries are made. When the Rohrberg, Commission of Enquiry entered Kief, after the taking of that town by the Volunteer Army in August 1919, it found the execution hall of the Cheka in the following state :

All the cement floor of the great garage (the execution hall

1. Letter from Bukharin to Britan, *La Revue universelle*, 1st March, 1928.

of the departmental Cheka of Kief) was flooded with blood. This blood was no longer flowing, it formed a layer of several inches : it was a horrible mixture of blood, brains, of pieces of skull, of tufts of hair and other human remains. All the walls riddled by thousands of bullets were bespattered with blood ; pieces of brains and of scalps were sticking to them.

A gutter twenty-five centimetres wide by twenty five centimetres deep and about ten metres long ran from the centre of the garage towards a subterranean drain. This gutter along, its whole length was full to the top of blood... Usually, as soon as the massacre had taken place the bodies were conveyed out of the town in motor lorries and buried beside the grave about which we have spoken ; we found in a corner of the garden another grave which was older and contained about eighty bodies. Here we discovered on the bodies traces of cruelty and mutilations the most varied and unimaginable. Some bodies were disembowelled, others had limbs chopped off, some were literally hacked to pieces. Some had their eyes put out and the head, face, neck and trunk covered with deep wounds. Further on we found a corpse with a wedge driven into the chest. Some had no tongues. In a corner of the grave we discovered a certain quantity of arms and legs ¹...

We have no exact documents permitting us to estimate exactly the total number of victims, the figures given exceed imagination.

Professor Sarolea gives in the *Scotsman* 7th November 1923 the following figures ².

28 bishops, 1219 priests, 6000 professors and teachers, 9000 doctors, 54.000 officers, 260,000 soldiers, 70.000 policemen, 12.950 property owners, 535.250 members of the intellectual and liberal professions, 193.290 workmen, 618.000 peasants.

The commission of enquiry of Denikin on Bolshevik

1. See S. P. MELGOUNOV, *La terreur rouge en Russie*. Payot, 1927, p. 161.

2. These are the official figures published everywhere.

proceedings during the period 1918-1919, in an account of the Red Terror, computed 1.700.000 victims.

Elsewhere a theoretical computation has been made by Ev. Komnin in the Roul (3, VIII, 1923) :

During the winter of 1920 the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics comprised 52 governments with 52 Extraordinary Commissions (Cheka), 52 special sections and 52 revolutionary tribunals, Moreover numberless « Este-Chekas », Chekas for transport systems, Chekas for railways, tribunals for troops for internal security, flying tribunals sent for mass executions on the spot. To this list of torture chambers the special sections must be added, 16 army and divisional tribunals. In all a thousand chambers of torture must be reckoned, and if we take into consideration that there existed at this time cantonal Chekas, we must add even more.

Since then the number of Soviet Governments has grown : Siberia, the Crimea, the Far East, have been conquered. The number of Chekas has grown in geometrical proportion.

According to direct data (in 1920, when the Terror had not diminished and information on the subject had not been reduced) it was possible to arrive at a daily average figure for each tribunal : the curve of executions rises from one to fifty (the latter figure in the big centres) and up to one hundred in regions recently conquered by the Red Army. The crises of Terror were periodical, then they ceased, so that it is possible to establish the (modest) figure of five victims a day, which multiplied by the number of one thousand tribunals gives five thousand, and about a million and a half per annum ! ¹

However unbelievable these figure may appear, these three different sets of statistics are sufficiently in agreement, and have certainly a strong foundation of truth.

The Red Terror became so wide-spread that it is impossible to give here all the details of the principal means

1. S. P. MELGOUNOV, p. 104.

employed by the Cheka¹ to master resistance ; one of the most important is that of hostages, taken among all social classes. These are held responsible for any anti-Bolshevist movements (revolts, the White Army, strikes, refusal of a village to give its harvest etc...) and are immediately executed. Thus, for the assassination of the Jew Ouritzky, member of the Extraordinary Commission of Petrograd, several thousands of them were put to death, and many of these unfortunate men and women suffered before death various tortures inflicted by cold-blooded cruelty in the prisons of the Cheka.

Thus I have in front of me photographs taken at Kharkoff, in the presence of the Allied Missions, immediately after the Reds had abandoned the town ; they consist of a series of ghastly reproductions such as : Bodies of three workmen taken as hostages from a factory which went on strike. One had his eyes burnt, his lips and nose cut off ; the other two had their hands cut off.

The bodies of hostages, S. Afaniasouk and P. Prokypovitch, small landed proprietors, who were scalped by their executioners ; S. Afaniasouk shows numerous burns caused by a white hot sword blade.

The body of M. Bobroff, a former officer, who had his tongue and one hand cut off and the skin torn off from his left leg.

Human skin torn from the hands of several victims by means of a metallic comb. This sinister find was the result of a careful inspection of the cellar of the Extraordinary Commission of Kharkoff. The retired general Pontiafa, a hostage who had the skin of his right hand torn off and the genital parts mutilated.

Mutilated bodies of women hostages : S. Ivanovna, owner of a drapery business, M^{me} A. L. Carolshaja, wife of a colonel, M^{me} Khlopova, a property owner. They had their breasts slit

1. New replaced by the GUERREOU.

and emptied and the genital parts burnt and having trace of coal.

Bodies of four peasant hostages, Bondarenko, Pookhikie, Sevenetry, and Sidorfchouk, with atrociously mutilated faces, the genital parts having been operated upon by Chinese torturers in a manner unknown to European doctors in whose opinion the agony caused to the victims must have been dreadful.

It is impossible to enumerate all the forms of savagery which the Red Terror took. A volume would not contain them.

The Cheka of Kharkoff, for example, in which Saenko operated, had the speciality of scalping victims and taking off the skin of their hands as one takes off a glove... At Voronege the victims were shut up naked in a barrel studded with nails which was then rolled about. Their foreheads were branded with a red hot iron five pointed star. At Tsaritsin and at Kamishin their bones were sawed... At Kief the victim was shut up in a chest containing decomposing corpses; after firing shots above his head his torturers told him that he would be buried alive. The chest was buried and opened again half an hour later when the interrogation of the victim was proceeded with. The scene was repeated several times over. It is not surprising that many victims went mad¹.

Let us recall that on the 17th July 1918 at Ekaterinenburg, and on the order of the Cheka (order given by the Jew Sverdloff from Moscow) the commission of execution commanded by the Jew Yourowsky, assassinated by shooting or by bayoneting the Czar, Czarina, Czarevitch, the four Grand Duchesses, Dr Botkin, the manservant, the woman servant, the cook and the dog.

The members of the imperial family in closest succession to the throne were assassinated in the following night. The Grand Dukes Mikhaïlovitch, Constantinovitch, Vladimir Paley and the Grand Duchess Elisabeth

1. S. P. MELGOUNOV, *op. cit.*, p. 164-166.

Feodorovna were thrown down a well at Alapaïevsk, in Siberia. The Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovitch was assassinated at Perm with his suite ¹.

Dostoïewsky was not right when he said :

An odd fancy sometimes comes into my head : What would happen in Russia if instead of three million Jews which are there, there were three million Russians and eighty million Jews ?

What would have happened to these Russians among the Jews and how would they have been treated ? Would they have been placed on an equal footing with them ? Would they have permitted them to pray freely ? Would they not have simply made them slaves, or even worse : would they not have simply flayed the skin from them ? Would they not have massacred them until completely destroyed, as they did with other peoples of antiquity in the times of their olden history ?...

What is going to happen in Russia now ?

The present situation is as follows :

Bolshevism the agent of destruction has accomplished its mission : its very violence prevents it from lasting eternally. The time has come to proceed gradually to a durable form of government ; in the nature of the French Republic, a most convenient form, for, cloaking the real masters, it would permit Jewry to establish itself definitely in Russia and to benefit fully from the victory obtained, thanks to Bolshevism, over the Russian people.

Unfortunately the Soviet leaders, probably exceeding orders, have gone too far, which has had for them the disadvantage of showing to some extent their cards. People have begun to see that the world revolution

1. See book of Nicholas SOKOLOFF, *L'enquête judiciaire sur l'Assassinat de la famille impériale*. Payot, 1924.

was partly artificial, the work of a conspiracy directed principally by the Jews.

Thus Communism is only maintained in Russia by the Terror. As soon as it is relaxed, pogroms appear.

In consequence, world Jewry and Masonic governments (such as that of France for example) pretend to blame Bolshevism by condemning its unpopular excesses, whilst in fact they are supporting it and making it last until the means are found for it to evolve into a more lasting form.

If it were to fall at present, the reaction, would be such that it is doubtful whether Judaeo-Masonry with all its power would be able to prevent the re-establishment of a national and religious Russia governed by a monarchist leader with absolute power. It would be a catastrophe for Judaeo-Masonry which will do the utmost to avoid it, for the world would then learn with dismay what Bolshevism really was.

The true authors of world revolution and their objects would for the first time appear in the light of day and it would be the end of democratic, socialist and other illusions. Russia, henceforth a forbidden land to Freemasons, to Jews, and to International Revolutionaries, and able, thanks to its natural resources to be self-supporting without passing through the Gaudine Forks of Jewish High Finance, would be the base upon which the counter-revolutionary elements of the world would lean. These, instead of fighting blindly against an invisible, subterranean enemy, would know whom to attack. It would be without doubt the beginning of a new general orientation of the world in order to deviate from the revolutionary slope down which it has been slipping since 1789.

Involuntarily one asks the question :

How does the civilized world permit such a state of things to reign over the sixth part of the globe ? If there was still a monarchy in Russia, it goes without saying that nobody would admit it. There would be thundering questions in the parliaments of the two hemispheres, fiery protests from all the leagues of the « Rights of Man », articles in the indignant newspapers, a rapid and unanimous understanding among all social classes and a whole series of national, economic, diplomatic and military measures for the destruction of this plague. But present-day democracy is much less troubled about it than about a cold of Macdonald or the broken nose of Carpentier.

And although the occidental bourgeoisie knows perfectly well that the Soviet power is its irreconcilable enemy, with which no understanding is possible, that moreover, it would be useless since economically Russia is nothing more than a corpse, nevertheless the flirtation of this bourgeoisie with the Comintern lasts and threatens to become a long romance.

To this question there is only one answer : as in western Europe international Judaism ¹ holds in its hands political power as strongly as the Jewish Communists hold it in Russia, it does all that is humanly possible to retard the day when the latter will fall ².

1. Or its ally Free Masonry.

2. *Weltkampf*, Munich, July 1921.

JEWS AND SOCIALISM

We have dwelt at length with Bolshevism, for it has shown the revolutionary action of the Jews in the full light of day ; their part in it has become apparent indeed during the violent revolution, but although less visible, they are none the less the directors of revolutionary socialism in all its forms all over the world.

In that which concerns the Jews, their part in world socialism is so important that it is impossible to pass it over in silence. Is it not sufficient to recall the names of the great Jewish revolutionaries of the 19 and 20th centuries, Karl Marx, Lassalle, Kurt Eisner, Bela Kuhn, Trotsky, Léon Blum, so that the names of the theorists of modern socialism should at the same time be mentioned ? If it is not possible to declare Bolshevism, taken as a whole, a Jewish creation it is nevertheless true that the Jews have furnished several leaders to the Maximalist movement and that in fact they have played a considerable part in it.

Jewish tendencies towards communism, apart from all material collaboration with party organizations, what a strong confirmation do they not find in the deep aversion which, a great Jew, a great poet, Henry Heine felt for Roman Law ! The subjective causes, the passionate causes of the revolt of Rabbi Aqiba and of Bar Kocheba in the year 70 a. d. against the Pax Romana and the Jus Romanum, were understood and felt subjectively and passionately by a Jew of the 19th century who apparently had maintained no connection with his race !

Both the Jewish revolutionaries and the Jewish communists

who attack the principle of private property, of which the most solid monument is the Codex Juris Civilis of Justinianus, of Ulpian, etc..., are doing nothing different from their ancestors who resisted Vespasian and Titus.

In reality it is the dead who speak ! ¹

Jews were the creators of socialism. The great prophet of the collectivist idea and the founder of the International, Karl Marx, was a Jew whose real name was Mordechaï. Jews are the present leaders of the movement, and its funds are from Jewish sources which explains perhaps the limitless amount of the resources at the disposal of the socialists; in France, the newspaper *Humanité* has been founded by Jewish money.

It is the same for the greater part of socialist newspapers throughout the world.

In England,

Jewish influence on the less extreme forms of Socialism in this country is no less apparent. If the Labour Party is solidly pro-German, it is also solidly pro-Jewish ².

Moreover, on the subject of Jewish influence in socialism, nobody is more definite than one of the spiritual leaders of Judaism, Mr Alfred Nossig, who says word for word in his book « Le Judaïsme intégral » (Integrales Judentum).

68. Socialism and the Mosaic code are programmes which are not at all in opposition. Between the fundamental ideas of the two doctrines there is on the contrary a striking agreement. Jewish nationalism ought not to turn from Socialism as from a danger which threatens its ideal, nor Jewish Socialism turn from the Mosaic code. The two parallel ideals will be realized by following the same road.

1. KADMI KOHEN : *Nomades*. F. Alcan, Paris, 1929. P. 26.

2. WEBSTER, *Secret Societies*, p. 387.

71. From an examination of the facts it emerges in an irrefutable manner that : it is not only modern Jews who have co-operated in a decisive manner in the creation of socialism ; their own Fathers were already the founders of the Mosaic system... or in another form the Mosaic system is socialism freed from the Utopias and Terror of Communism, as well as from the « ascèse » of Christianity.

The Mosaic code throughout the ages both as a doctrine and as a law, has influenced some consciously and others unconsciously.

74. The modern socialist movement is in great part the work of Jews ; it was the Jews who imprinted upon it the mark of their brain ; it was equally the Jews who had a preponderant part in the government of the first socialist republics, although the Jewish socialist leaders were for the most part estranged from Judaism ; in spite of which the part which they played did not depend on them alone ; in them was operating in an unconscious fashion the race-cultural system of the Mosaic doctrine, the blood of the old apostolic people was living in their brain and in their social temperament.

Present day world socialism forms the first stage in the accomplishment of the Mosaic teaching, the beginning of the realization of the future state of the world announced by our prophets¹.

79. It is not until there will be a League of Nations, it is not until its allied armies will be employed in an efficacious manner for the protection of all the weak races, that we shall be able to hope that the Jews will be in a position to develop without hindrance their national state in Palestine, and equally it will only be a League of Nations impregnated with the socialist spirit which will render possible for us the possession of our international as well as of our national requirements.

This is why all Jewish groups whatever they are, Zionists or adepts of the Diaspora, have a vital interest in the victory of socialism ; they must exact it not only on principle, not only

1. Passage italicized by us.

*because of its identity with the Mosaic doctrine, but also on tactical grounds*¹.

87. The Jewish socialist is reproached with playing a leading part not only in the collectivist party but also in the communist terrorist party. This must be regretted by all Jews, who in as much as they are true disciples of the Mosaic teaching, disapprove of the Terror. This is only explained by two reasons; the complete estrangement of the Jewish terrorists from the spirit of the Mosaic doctrine and the strong mixture of Tartar and Cossack blood. That has not prevented the dissenters of Jewish race from being exalted in the socialist idea, but it has inculcated in them savage and cruel principles.

We have just seen the preponderant part played by Judaism in the modern revolutionary movement, Bolshevism, socialism etc. Let us now examine the direction of Jewish influence in the world in general and in the different branches of human activity.

1. Passage italicized by us.

JEWISH INFLUENCE IN THE WORLD

Throughout the world and in all parts Jewish activity is exercised consciously or unconsciously in a revolutionary direction destructive of Christian civilization. The two poles of the Jewish people — at the bottom the socialist and bolshevist revolutionaries, at the top the High Finance — are working in the same direction.

Consciously or unconsciously, I have said, there is indeed a radical difference between the two conceptions of existence, the Jewish conception, which believes in the immense value of earthly life (the Kingdom of God upon earth), and which thrusts from it the hope of a future life, and the Christian conception which is based on the inverse. Whether one admits or whether one denies the idea of a world wide Jewish conspiracy, the fact remains nevertheless that since 1789 the Jewish idea is gaining the upper hand over the Christian idea which had hitherto prevailed, and the general materialism which proceeds from it logically brings the atheism, the socialism and the universal anarchy from which we are suffering.

The Jewish question is then before everything a question of safe-guarding our civilisation and our culture, a question of changing the face of the world.

Without us Aryans being conscious of it, the idealism pertaining to our race, that idealism which was so zealous through-

out the ages for all that is beautiful, all that is noble, for sincerity, loyalty, right, duty, trust, all this is being irresistably impelled by the seductive conception of Jewry towards a cynical and unscrupulous materialism, which finds its political expression in the Judaeo-Masonic universal atheist republic.

The propagation of the Jewish idea is then destructive for us ; and for spreading its ideas and putting them into practice, Judaism has, as its chief forces, gold and the Press.

Thanks to them it directs or interferes with everything which acts on public opinion and everything which has a revolutionary influence in the world : Free Masonry, Socialism, Communism, Theosophy, the Theatre, the Cinema, News Agencies, Wireless, Education, etc. It has an effective influence on most governments, either indirectly through Free Masonry, or directly by selected Jewish nationals who surround and direct the leaders of the State and influential politicians, as we have seen it in a preponderant fashion at the Peace Conference.

The following are a few precisions on these various points.

JEWS AND ECONOMIC LIFE

Jewish commercial and financial genius is too well-known for it to be necessary to speak of it here ¹.

Jews have been the inventors of modern business methods ; at present they are the kings of finance. All the countries in which their influence is dominating enjoy the benefit of an intense economic activity, but what is the cost of such material advantage ! No one has the right to blame their economic success ; but one can examine the means which they employ to achieve it, and above all the use which they make of their financial power.

Gold is an instrument of power which can serve for good or evil. Up to the present, they have applied it in a way useful for the Jewish race, but harmful for all others, There is the whole question.

Their economic influence is bad for us occidental Christians in three ways :

By the spread in the world of the Jewish mentality for gold.

By the manner in which they acquire this gold.

By the use which they make of it.

The Jewish mentality for gold has a religious basis, for :

1. Consult especially SOMBART, *Les juifs et la vie économique*. Payot.

The principal characteristic of the Jewish religion consists in its being alien to the Hereafter, a religion, as it were, solely and essentially worldly ¹.

Man can only experience good or evil in this world ; if God wishes to punish or reward he can only do so during the life of man. It is therefore here below that the just must prosper and the impious suffer ².

Thus the Jewish religion exalts riches as the supreme blessing, and money is for the Jew the aim of life.

It is useless to insist upon the differences which proceed from this opposition between the two different views in the respective attitudes of the pious Jew and the pious Christian regarding the acquisition of wealth. While the pious Christian, who had been guilty of usury, was tormented on his death-bed by the tortures of repentance and was ready to give up all that he owned, for the possessions unjustly acquired were scorching his soul, the pious Jew, also at the end of his days looked with affection upon his coffers and chests filled to the top with the accumulated sequins taken during his long life from poor Christians and even from poor Moslems ; a sight which could cause his pious heart to rejoice, for every penny of interest enclosed therein was like a sacrifice offered to his God ³.

To-day, this mentality for gold has spread throughout the world, It has produced a general materialism and a harshness which is in part responsible for the class hatred which is one of the great destructive elements of our time ⁴. It is the rule of the machine and commercial-

1. WERNER SOMBART, *Les Juifs et la vie économique*. p. 291.

2. *Op. cit.*, p. 277.

3. *Op. cit.*, p. 286.

4. It appears worth noting that it was an English Jew banker, the well known economist David Ricardo, himself the son of a Dutch Jew banker who emigrated to London at the end of th

ism, brutal and purely material, without any moral counterpoise to diminish the harm which it causes.

The root cause of the evil is then the disappearance of all spiritual ideals.

Dostoïevsky¹ had already declared this as far back as 1873 in this prophetic passage :

Their kingdom is at hand, their perfect kingdom. The triumph of those ideas is approaching in the presence of which the sentiments of humanity are mute, the thirst for truth, the Christian and national feelings and even the common pride of the peoples of Europe.

That which is coming, on the contrary, is materialism, the blind and grasping appetite for personal material well-being, the thirst for the accumulation of money by any means ; that is all which is regarded as a higher aim, such as reason, such as liberty, instead of the Christian ideal of salvation by the sole means of the close moral and brotherly union between men.

People will laugh at this, and say that it does not in the least proceed from the Jews... Was the late James de Rothschild of Paris a bad man ? We are speaking about Judaism and the Jewish idea which has monopolized the whole world, instead of defective Christianity,

A thing will come about which nobody can yet even imagine. All this parliamentarism, these theories regarding the community which are believed in to-day, these accumulations of wealth, the banks, science, all that will collapse in the winking of an eye and without leaving a trace behind, except the Jews however, who will know then what they have to do,

18th century, who is the inventor and the theorist of a purely economic conception of the world which rules nearly everywhere to-day. The contemporary political commercialism — business above everything, business considered as the supreme aim of human effort — comes directly from Ricardo. G. BATAULT, *Le problème juif*, p. 40.

1. Fédor DOSTOÏEVSKY, *Journal d'un écrivain*, 1873-1876, 1877, éditions Bossard.

so that even this will be for their gain. All this is near, close by...

Yes, Europe is on the eve of collapse, a universal, terrible and general collapse...

To me Bismark, Beaconsfield the French Republic, Gambetta and others, are all only appearances. Their master, who is the same for every one else and for the whole of Europe, is the Jew and his bank.

We shall still see the day when he shall pronounce his veto and Bismark will be unexpectedly swept away like a piece of straw.

Judaism and the banks now reign over all, as much over Europe as over education, the whole of civilization and socialism, especially over socialism, for with its help Judaism will root out Christianity and destroy Christian culture.

And if nothing but anarchy results the Jew will be found directing all ; for although preaching socialism he will remain nevertheless in his capacity of Jew along with the brothers of his race, outside socialism, and when all the substance of Europe has been pillaged only the Jewish bank will subsist.

Capitalism then is not only an economic problem, it is a question of a spiritual problem before everything, of a problem of the European soul.

To conclude, the Jewish mentality for gold has invaded us, and this mentality is already in itself bad for us. But Jewish influence is also dangerous for us in two other ways :

The manner in which they acquire gold and the use that they make of it.

The Jews have always been reproached for being parasites, with never procuring their wealth by production but by the exploitation of the production of others. It is one of themselves who has said :

Wars and revolutions are the harvests of the Jew.

This is not a recent discovery. Here is what is said on this subject in the official report of Baron Malouet to M. de Sartinne on the demands of the Portuguese Jews in 1776.

No traveller has seen a plot of ground ploughed by Jews, a manufacture created or supplied by them. In every place into which they have penetrated they are exclusively given up to the trades of brokers, dealers in second hand goods and usurers, and the richest amongst them then become merchants, chandlers and bankers.

The King of Prussia wished to establish them in his States and make them citizens ; he has been obliged to give up his idea because he has seen he would only be multiplying the class of retailers and usurers.

Several Princes of Germany and barons of the Empire have summoned them to their states, thinking to gain from them great advantages for their commerce ; but the stock-jobbing of the Jews and their usury soon brought into their hands the greater part of the current coin in these small countries which they impoverished in the long run.

This is what Werner Sombart says to us :

It is really time to give up once and for all the legend according to which the Jews were obliged during the European middle ages, and above all « since the Crusades », to devote themselves to usury because all other professions were closed to them. The 2000 year old history of Jewish usury previous to the Middle ages suffices to indicate the falseness of this historic conclusion. But even in that which concerns the Middle ages and modern times the statements of official historiography are far from agreeing with the reality of the facts. It is not true that all careers in general were closed to Jews during the middle ages and modern times, but they preferred to apply themselves to the lending of money on security. This is what Bucher has proved for the town of Frankfort-on-the-Maine, and it is easy to prove it for many other towns and other

countries. Here is irrefutable proof of the natural tendencies of the Jews for the trade of money-lenders ; in the Middle ages and later we particularly see governments striving to direct the Jews towards other careers without succeeding¹.

To-day the operations have become extended ; instead of lending to private individuals they lend to governments and to states, but the principle has remained the same. The Jews are international financiers, and not producers, for the producer is a conservative and the other is not.

Finally the Jews have a bad influence for us by the use which they make of gold.

The financial help offered by them to the Russian Revolution is a well known fact. Reviewing a recent book² by Mr Lancelot Lawton the 7 April number of the *Patriot* wrote :

Mr Lawton, in one remark, throws a sidelight on the moving forces behind the revolution, which might suggest to him further investigation as to origin of what has become a world movement. That movement cannot any longer be shrouded by superficial talk of the severity of the Russian regime, which is so favourite an excuse among our Socialists for the most atrocious action, of the Bolsheviki, who did not come into power till six months after Tsardom was ended :

I wish to emphasize the paramount role which the power of money played in bringing about the Revolution. And here it may not be out of place to mention that well documented works have recently been published in France proving that neither Robespierre nor Danton were isolated figures upon the revolutionary stage, but that both were puppets of financial backers.

1. W. SOMBART, *op. cit.*, p. 401.

2. The Russian Revolution (1917-1926) by Lancelot Lawton, Macmillan.

Again on page 42 he says :

When the first revolution broke out Lenin was in Zurich, where he was financially helped by an old Swiss merchant, who later went to Russia to live as a permanent guest of the Revolution, and some time afterwards disappeared.

If Lenin had not obeyed the orders of his pay-masters how long would he have remained in the land of the living ?

International financiers are not however all Jews and they are not necessarily all vampires ; some of them, and the Jews are far from being behind in this respect, are celebrated for their charity. Money loses in their hands its usual signification and becomes a force, an instrument, of power and sometimes of domination ; such is the case for Jewish high finance.

On the one hand, Jewish high finance is very powerful : on the other hand it is linked up throughout the world and serves Jewish interests to the detriment of others. Its strength is in its organization and internationalism.

It is not the individual success of the Jewish banks which is in dispute, they have as much right to it as we and no one contests it ; but here we have to do with an international system of banks which are neither English, nor German, nor French, but Jewish and all connected with each other. It is neither the importance nor wealth of single banks, but the importance and wealth of the whole which makes the strength of the system.

Walter Rathenau in a communicative mood once said :

Three hundred men, who all know each other direct the economic destinies of the Continent and they look for successors among their friends and relations. This is not the place to examine the strange causes of this strange state of affairs which throws a ray of light on the obscurity of our social future.

It is certain that such an organisation constitutes a powerful force, capable of being used for good or for evil. Up to the present it has been employed for the good of the Jewish race to the detriment of the others.

These forces do not seek publicity, they are generally content to manage affairs from a distance by means of their banks or of their delegates and the world does not know them. At the necessary moment they appear suddenly and then as quickly recede into the background. A recent illustration of this fact happened during the Peace Conference at Versailles where the preponderance of Jewish influences was one of the facts which impressed observers most and which Dr E. J. Dillon has thus expressed.

It may seem amazing to some readers, but it is not the less a fact that a considerable number of delegates believed that the real influences behind the Anglo-Saxon people were semitic... The formula into which this policy was thrown by the members of the conference, whose countries it affected, and who regarded it as fatal to the peace of Eastern Europe ends thus : Henceforth the world will be governed by the Anglo-Saxon peoples, who, in turn, are swayed by their Jewish elements ¹.

At present then Jewish high finance is all powerful and serves Jewish interests exclusively. It would moreover be perfectly just to maintain that this is its right, only it is equally our right to oppose this foreign domination. For gold is only one of the weapons of Israel, a weapon of incalculable power, and to it alone yields that other force which the Chosen People knows so well how to handle : the Press.

Let us now examine Jewish influence in the Press.

1. Dr E. J. DILLON, *The inside Story of the Peace Conference*, pp. 496-497.

THE JEWS AND THE PRESS

The power of the Press is incalculable.

The newspaper has become the great school for adults ; it is almost their only source of information ; public opinion is only the reflection of the newspapers.

In a well-informed study on the power of the Press (*Grossmacht Press*), an Austrian writer, Eberlé has said :

An intelligent man, thoroughly familiar with the newspapers, can, after half an hour conversation, tell anyone what newspaper he reads... even high prelates of Rome, even Cardinals Amette and Mercier show themselves more influenced by the Press of their country than they themselves probably realize... often I have noticed that it is according to his newspaper that one judges the Papal Bull or the speech of the Prime Minister ¹.

An English prelate has said : « If in England the Bible maintained one thing and the *Times* maintained another out of 510 persons 500 would be of the opinion of the *Times*. »

The former minister Combes, promoter of the anti-religious struggle said : « Three quarters of the Catholics have been estranged from the Church by the Press ». And Cardinal Mercier, during his tour in America, was

1. J. EBERLÉ, *Grossmacht Press*, Vienna, 1920.

able to say with truth that it was thanks to the Press, that the Entente had won the War.

One cannot exaggerate the influence of the newspaper which ceaselessly, day by day, and even at every hour of the day holds forth everywhere, in the family, in the club, in the street, in the train, in factories and in the fields, in towns and in the country.

Thus M. Nordau (a Jew) has gone so far as to affirm that far more than all other modern inventions, it is the Press which gives to our age its character and of which it is the greatest force. More than any one the Jews have understood the importance of the Press.

What are you arguing about, said one of them, Baron Montefiore. So long as you do not have in your power the Press of the whole world, all that you do will be in vain.

Thus they have almost universally made themselves masters of it, for the Press is not and cannot be independent. A newspaper is, before everything, a commercial enterprise, and its primary concern is to live and to make as much money as possible.

A sincere independant newspaper, admitting that it could express its opinions freely, which is not at all certain if they were anti-revolutionary, would have to meet an annual deficit. the sale price of the paper hardly paying for more than the paper upon which it is printed.

Professor Lester T. Ward, in his book *Pure Sociology* has quoted the words pronounced by the journalist John Swinton during a banquet of the Press in New-York :

An independent Press does not exist in America except perhaps in small country towns ; journalists know it and I know it ; not one of them dares to express a sincere opinion ; if they do so, they know beforehand that it will never be printed. I am paid 150 dollars in order that I should not put my ideas

in the newspaper for which I write and that I should keep them to myself. Others are paid similar salaries for a similar service. If I succeeded in having my opinions published in a single issue of my newspaper, I should lose my post in twenty-four hours.

The man who would be insane enough to give frank expression to his thoughts would soon find himself in the streets on the look-out for another occupation. It is the duty of New York journalists to lie, to threaten, to bow down to the feet of Mammon, and to sell their country and their race for their salary, that is to say, for their daily bread...

We are the tools and the vassals of the rich who keep in the background ; we are puppets ; they pull the strings and we dance. Our time, our talent, our life, our abilities, all are the property of these men. We are intellectual prostitutes.

It is natural under these conditions, that sincere men and men of talent should withdraw more and more from journalism.

A newspaper depends on the government, on news-agencies, on commercial advertisements, and above all on the financial power of those who own and direct it.

No government could continue with absolute liberty of the Press. So governments exercise as strong an influence as possible by various means of which the principal are : financial corruption, favours, and the use of the Courts. The extreme limits of misleading propaganda were exceeded on both sides during the War.

The corruption does not consist in the government exercising influence on the Press ; such pressure is often necessary ; but in the fact that it is exercised secretly, so that the public believes that it is reading a general opinion when in reality it is a minister who speaks ; and the corruption of journalism does not consist in its serving the state, but in its patriotic convictions being in proportion to the amount of a subsidy ¹.

1. EBERLÉ, p. 128, *op. cit.*

From the point of view of news, a newspaper depends principally upon news-agencies ; these are vast organizations which centralize the news of the world and distribute it to the Press.

From the commercial point of view, a newspaper lives only by advertisements. This fact is too well-known to require further demonstration.

The situation is then the following :

The great telegraphic agencies of the world which are everywhere the principal source of news for the Press (just as wholesale businesses supply the retailers), which spreads far and wide that which the world should know or should not know, and in the form which they wish, these agencies are either Jewish property or obey Jewish direction.

The situation is the same for the smaller agencies which supply news to the newspapers of less importance, the great publicity agencies which receive commercial advertisements and which then insert them in the newspapers at the price of a large commission for themselves, are principally in the hands of the Jews ; so are many provincial newspapers. Even when the Jewish voice is not heard directly in the Press, there comes into play the great indirect influences, Free Masonry, Finance, etc.

In many places Jews content themselves with this hidden influence, just as in economic life they consider Joint-Stock companies as the most profitable.

The editors may quite well be Aryans, it is sufficient that in all important questions they should stand for Jewish interests, or at least that they should not oppose them. This is achieved nearly always by the pressure of advertisement agencies ¹.

M. Eberlé gives complete statistics of the world Press, country by country, from which it appears that in Ger-

1. EBERLÉ, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

many, three quarters of the newspapers are Jewish, as well as the news agencies Wolf and the two other secondary agencies Hirsch and Press Telegraph.

The situation is almost the same in France. Already in 1894 Rochefort said. « Look at the Press ! There is no longer a French Press, it is all in the hands of the Jews. » On the whole, however, Masonic influence is more evident in it than Jewish influence. Mrs Webster, speaking of the English Press, writes : « It would not be an exaggeration to say that there is hardly a newspaper in this country, with the exception of the *Patriot*, which dares to speak freely on questions touching Jewish interests. »

The advertisement agencies which distribute advertisements to the papers are a powerful means of pressure ; the Jews who withhold them being thus able to cut off supplies from any newspaper by withdrawing from it advertisement contracts, The story of the Jewish contest with Gordon Bennett, the proprietor of the *New York Herald*, is very suggestive in this respect.

Austria before the war offered us an example of the result of Jewish domination of the Press.

The Jewish Press of Vienna sold everything, put everything at a price, artistic fame as well as success in business. No intellectual production, no work of art has been able to see the light of day and reach public notice, without passing by the crucible of the Jewish Press, without having to submit to its criticism or to pay for its approval. If an artist should wish to obtain the approbation of the public, he must of necessity bow before the all powerful Hebrew journalists. If a young actress, a musician, a singer of talent should wish to make her first appearance and to venture before a more or less numerous audience, she has in most cases not dared to do so, unless after paying tribute to the desires of Israel. Otherwise she would fear almost certain failure. It was despotic tyranny re-established, this time for the profit of the

Jews and brutally exercised by them in all its plenitude.

Such as it is revealed by its results, the Viennese Press dominated by Judaism, has been absolutely disastrous. It is a work of death which it has accomplished. Around it and outside it all is void. In all the classes of the population are the germs of hatred, the seeds, of discord and of jealousy, dissolution and decomposition ¹.

THE IMPORT OF JEWISH INFLUENCE IN THE PRESS.

Naturally, Judaism, master of a part of the Press, uses it to serve Jewish interests, notably in preventing any anti-revolutionary publications and in spreading throughout the world ideas favourable to Judaism.

All anti-revolutionary campaigns from their beginning meet with systematic obstruction from the Press which shows itself either by silence (refusal to publish), or by violent attacks, without possibility of replying, against the individual who dares to attack the revolution even indirectly. If one dares to denounce the Jews directly then there is a general hue and cry, and the culprit is usually rendered powerless to hurt in a very short time.

The Press being irresponsible and anonymous, does not draw back from any distortion of news, lie, calumny.

Thus we see the universal Press, including a part of the conservative Press, bellow and stir up opinion against Mussolini whom it calls a barbarian tyrant when he expels a revolutionary from Italy, though this same Press passes over almost in silence the three million Russians executed by the Bolshevist Cheka.

Naturally in many conservative or so-called con-

1. F. TROCEN, *L'Autriche juive*, 1898. A. Pierret, éd., Paris.

servative newspapers there appear anti-revolutionary articles (the contrary would be too strange), but they are carefully doctored so as to be only a semblance and not to touch the inner meaning of revolution ; the skill consists in directing organs of all the parties from Bolshevism to the extreme Right. This permits the neutralization of public opinion by maintaining its tranquility and its direction in the desired way by a subtle propaganda presented to each class of reader in the form which makes it acceptable. The masters of the press do not use it only to avoid all attack, but also to spread universally ideas which favour Judaism, whence the general tendencies of the world Press which is on the whole :

Liberal, democratic, republican ;

Socialist,

Anti-religious.

Materialist.

In a word, revolutionary in general.

JEWISH INFLUENCE IN THE WORLD.

The same influence is also exercised although less widely, in literature, achieving by subtle advertisement the reputation of those authors whose ideas are considered useful to the revolution. (In a wide sense every idea is useful which disintegrates Christian society, liberalism, sensuality, materialism, determinism etc... Freud, Einstein are examples). As in the Press, obstacles are placed in the way of those who are hostile to it, and if that is not sufficient, more energetic means are then employed. It is very instructive in this respect to note the struggle which has been necessary in each country in order to get the Protocols published and the rapidity with which they have disappeared from circulation.

The following is a significant passage on this subject by the English historian N. H. Webster :

When I first began to write on Revolution a well known London Publisher said to me : « Remember that if you take an anti revolutionary line you will have the whole literary world against you. » This appeared to me extraordinary. Why should the literary world sympathize with a movement which, from the French revolution onwards, has always been directed against literature, art, and science, and has openly proclaimed its aim to exalt the manual workers over the intelligentsia ?

« Writers must be proscribed as the most dangerous enemies of the people » said Robespierre ; his colleague Dumas said all

clever men should be guillotined. The system of persecution against men of talents was organized... they cried out in the Sections (of Paris) « Beware of that man for he has written a book ¹ ». Precisely the same policy has been followed in Russia. Under moderate socialism in Germany the professors, not the « people », are starving in garrets. Yet the whole Press of our country is permeated with subversive influences. Not merely in partisan works, but in manuals of history or literature for use in schools, Burke is reproached for warning us against the French Revolution and Carlyle's panegyric is applauded. And whilst every slip on the part of an anti revolutionnary writer is seized on by the critics and held up as an example of the whole, the most glaring errors not only of conclusions but of facts pass unchallenged if they happen to be committed by a partisan of the movement. The principle laid down by Collot d'Herbois still holds good : « Tout est permis pour quiconque agit dans le sens de la révolution. »

All this was unknown to me when I first embarked on my work. I knew that French writers of the past had distorted facts to suit their own political views, that a conspiracy of history is still directed by certain influences in the masonic lodges and the Sorbonne ; I did not know that this conspiracy was being carried on in this country. Therefore the publisher's warning did not daunt me. If I was wrong either in my conclusions or facts I was prepared to be challenged. Should not years of laborious historical research meet either with recognition or with reasoned and scholarly refutation ?

But although my book received a great many generous and appreciative reviews in the Press, criticisms which were hostile took a form which I had never anticipated. Not a single honest attempt was made to refute either my *French Revolution* or *World Revolution* by the usual methods of controversy : Statements founded on documentary evidence were met with flat contradiction unsupported by a shred of counter evidence. In general the plan adopted was not to disprove, but to discredit by means of flagrant misquotations, by attributing to

1. Moniteur for the 14th fructidor, an II.

me views I had never expressed, or even by means of offensive personalities. It will surely be admitted that this method of attack is unparalleled in any other sphere of literary controversy ¹.

The theatre, the cinema, even wireless are powerful means of influencing public opinion : so they are profoundly imbued with Free Masonry and Jewish ideas, not only their directors and their actors, but also the general tendencies of their preponderant ideas. In the cinema most of the films given in Europe come from the great American firms such as the Metro-Goldwyn, the Fox film etc., which are all almost entirely Jewish.

The revolutionary tendencies of the every-day theatre have often been described, N. H. Webster speaking for England writes :

We have only to look around us in the world to-day, to see everywhere the same disintegrating power at work — in art, literature, the drama, the daily Press — in every sphere that can influence the mind of the public... our modern cinemas perpetually endeavour to stir up class hatred by scenes and phrases showing « the injustice of Kings » « the sufferings of the people » « the Selfishness of Aristocrats » regardless of whether these enter into the theme of the narrative or not. And in the realms of literature, not merely in works of fiction but in manuals for schools, in histories and books professing to be of serious educative value and receiving a skillfully organized boom throughout the press, everything is done to weaken patriotism, to shake belief in all existing institutions by the systematic perversion of both contemporary and historical facts. I do not believe that all this is accidental ; I do not believe that the public asks for the anti-patriotic or demoralizing books and plays placed before it ; on the contrary it

1. N. H. WEBSTER. *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, London, 1924. Boswell. Preface.

invariably responds to an appeal to Patriotism and simple healthy emotions. The heart of the people is still sound, but ceaseless efforts are made to corrupt it¹.

The disintegrating influence extends to all branches of human activity, to science, to art and to fashions with subversive theories such as, Freudism, Theosophy, Christian Science and certain general artistic tendencies seeking to overthrow the hitherto established rules of what is beautiful.

On the subject of arts, and especially of painting, it may be remarked that Jews have been entirely absent from them in the past, that is to say in the time when artists achieved reputation late in life after an existence of labour and hardships (the painters Israël, Pissarro, are rare exceptions). But since pictures have become the object of an intense and fruitful trade (we are not speaking here of quality but of quantity) the Jews have taken possession in increasing number of the professions of painting, engraving and sculpture.

It goes without saying, that in this work of dissolution, education plays a primordial part. Everybody knows the efforts made everywhere and especially in France, to establish atheistic lay education. But as this happens openly it is outside the scope of the present work which is concerned to show the occult forces of the revolution. We only mention it then without going into details.

We have just seen the revolutionary side of Jewish influence in the world in general, and in modern revolutions in particular. It is now time to examine Judaism closely in order to know exactly what it is, what it wishes, what it has obtained, briefly, its general organization.

1. N. H. WEBSTER, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, p. 342.

SECOND PART

THE ORGANISATION OF JUDAISM

THE CAUSES OF GENERAL HOSTILITY BETWEEN JEWS AND NON-JEWS

The Jews have always been the object of general hostility on the part of the peoples among whom they lived; are they then victims, as they pretend, or oppressors? As Bernard Lazare one of themselves, says clearly :

If this hostility, even aversion, had only been shown towards the Jews at one period and in one country, it would be easy to unravel the limited causes of this anger, but this race has been on the contrary an object of hatred to all the peoples among whom it has established itself. It must be therefore, since the enemies of the Jews belonged to the most diverse races, since they lived in countries very distant from each other, since they were ruled by very different laws, governed by opposite principles, since they had neither the same morals, nor the same customs, since they were animated by unlike dispositions which did not permit them to judge of anything in the same way, it must be therefore that the general cause of Anti-Semitism has always resided in Israel itself and not in those who have fought against Israel.

The reasons of this antipathy have been exposed many times and may be summed up in the three following groups :

The Jews everywhere and always have been strangers, parasites and revolutionaries, moreover, during the Middle Ages they were regarded as the putters to death of Christ.

The accusation of putting Christ to death, having with the weakening of Christianity lost its vigour, we only mention it without commentary.

They are strangers : unsociable and not to be assimilated because they are exclusive and intolerant.

What virtues and what vices brought upon the Jew this universal enmity ? Why was he in turn equally maltreated and hated by the Alexandrians and the Romans, by the Persians and the Arabs, by the Turks and by the Christian nations ? Because everywhere and up to the present day, the Jew was an unsociable being.

Why was he unsociable ? Because he was exclusive and his exclusiveness was at the same time political and religious, or, in other words, he kept to his political, religious cult and his law ¹.

To his unsociability the Jew added exclusiveness. Without the Law, without Israel to practise it, the world would not exist, God would make it return again into a state of nothing ; and the world will not know happiness until it is subjected to the universal empire of that law, that is to say, to the empire of the Jews. In consequence the Jewish people is the people chosen by God as the trustee of his wishes and desires ; it is the only one with which the Divinity has made a pact, it is the elected of the Lord...

Israel is the favourite son of the Eternal, the one who alone has the right to his love, to his benevolence, to his special protection, and other men are placed beneath the Hebrews ; they have only the right through pity to the Divine bounty, since the souls of the Jews alone descend from the first man. The possessions entrusted to the nations belong in reality to Israel, and we see Jesus himself reply to the Greek woman :

1. B. LAZARE, *L'Antisemitism*, p. 3.

« It is not right to cast the bread of the children to the dogs. »

This faith in their predestination, in their election, developed in the Jews an immense pride ; they came to look upon non-Jews with contempt and often with hatred, when patriotic reasons were added to theological ones ¹.

Beyond the fact of being strangers, the Jews have been reproached with being parasites producing nothing themselves but exploiting the work of others. It is unnecessary to return to this subject which we have treated in the chapter : Jews and Economic Life.

Let us pass therefore to the third complaint : the Jews are revolutionaries. They have always been so and the numerous examples which we have quoted of their activity in socialism bring to the support of this assertion an alarming confirmation.

Their revolutionary tendencies assume to-day two phases:

On the one hand they are rebels fighting against all authority and on the other they are revolutionaries in the present meaning of the word, that is to say, they are the best supporters of the principles of 1789 and socialism is to a great extent one of their creations.

They were always malcontents.

I do not mean to suggest by that that they have been simply fault-finders and systematic opponents of all government, but the state of things did not satisfy them ; they were perpetually restless, in the expectation of a better state which they never found realized. Their ideal was not one of those which is satisfied with hope — they had not placed it high enough for that — they could not lull their ambition with dreams and visions. They believed in their right to demand immediate satisfactions instead of distant promises. From this has sprung the constant agitation of the Jews.

1. B. LAZARE, *L'Antisemitism*, pages 8 and 9.

The causes which brought about the birth of this agitation, which maintained and perpetuated it in the soul of some modern Jews, are not external causes such as the effective tyranny of a prince, of a people, or of a harsh code ; they are internal causes, that is to say, which adhere to the very essence of the Hebraic spirit. In the idea of God which the Israelites imagined, in their conception of life and of death, we must seek for the reasons of these feelings of revolt with which they are animated ¹.

1. B. LAZARE, *L'Antisemitism*, p. 306.

THE JEWISH RACE

The Jews form a distinct race, a race which cannot be assimilated and with clearly marked physical and spiritual characteristics.

When some Jews say that they consider themselves as a religious sect, like Roman Catholics or Protestants, they do not analyse correctly their own attitude and sentiments... Even if a Jew is baptized or, that which is not necessarily the same thing, sincerely converted to Christianity, it is rare if he is not still regarded as a Jew ; his blood, his temperament and his spiritual particularities remain unchanged ¹.

On the physical plane it is an obvious fact :

The extraordinary, the absurd persistence of the Semitic race.

And in the race the persistence of physical types : perfectly Westernized Jews sometimes preserve in their features a striking resemblance to the Arab bedouin from whom they are separated by a period of three thousand years.

The permanency of certain tastes is moreover significant. Centuries of life among Slav and Nordic populations have not taken from the Jew his frenzy, his need of gesticulation, not even his immoderate love of the highly spiced foods of the Mediterranean.

These examples of stability, so surprising that one is obliged

1. *The Jew and the Nation*. Ad. LEWIS, the Zionist Association of West London.

to give to them the name of survival, are so numerous that they indeed comprise the whole of Arab life and the whole of Jewish life ¹.

There is in the destiny of the race, as in the Semitic character a fixity, a stability, an immortality which impress the mind. One might attempt to explain this fixity by the absence of mixed marriages, but where could one find the cause of this repulsion for the woman or man stranger to the race ? Why this negative duration ?

There is consanguinity between the Gaul described by Julius Caesar and the modern Frenchman, between the German of Tacitus and the German of to-day. A considerable distance has been traversed between that chapter of the « Commentaries » and the plays of Molière. But if the first is the bud the second is the full bloom.

Life, movement, dissimilarities appear in the development of characters, and their contemporary form is only the maturity of an organism which was young several centuries ago, and which, in several centuries will reach old age and disappear.

There is nothing of this among the Semites. Like the consonants of their language they appear from the dawn of their race with a clearly defined character, in spare and needy forms, neither able to grow larger nor smaller, like a diamond which can score other substances but is too hard to be marked by any.

« I am what I am » says the Eternal. The Eternal — is the race.

One in substance, one in time, constant, eternal ².

On the mental side the Jewish character is as distinct as it is on the physical.

The writer whom we have just quoted : Kadmi

1. KADMI COHEN, *Nomades*, p. 112.

2. KADMI COHEN, *Nomades*, p. 115 and 116, italicized in the original text.

Cohen, has recently published under the auspices of A. de Monzie, ex-French minister, a work entitled *Nomades* which is a remarkable essay on the Jewish soul.

According to him the Jews are nomads and this fact explains their actual character.:

The unity of the Semitic conception finds a principal and absolute explanation in the nomadic character of the way of living of the Semites. A race of shepherds rather than of agriculturists they have been nomads. They have remained nomads. The mark is indelible like a cut on the trunk of a young tree. the trunk grows and develops, the mark grows longer and seems to alter its shape but it remains none the less recognisable.

If nomadic life has been the principal guardian of the unity of the race, that is because it has preserved it from a too-prolonged contact with the Earth, from being too long established on the same soil ¹.

It should be particularly noted that the nomadic state, contrary to what happened among other peoples, has never had among the Semites a character of transition or of a passing phase which precedes and prepares the settled life : its source lies in the bottom of the Semitic heart ².

That the nomadic life should alone have been sufficient to preserve the ethnical purity of the race is easily conceivable. The wandering life of a human group means its isolation, and in spite of its migrations from place to place, and indeed because of them, the tribe retains its individual nature ³.

Thus the blood which runs in its veins has kept its original purity and the passage of centuries will only serve to strengthen the importance of the race : it is definitively the predominance of the *jus sanguinis* over the *jus soli*.

1. KADMI COHEN, *Nomades*, p. 14.

2. KADMI COHEN, *Nomades*, p. 19.

3. KADMI COHEN, *Nomades*, p. 25.

The Semites and particularly the Jews, have furnished and still continue to furnish an historical and natural proof of this phenomenon. Nowhere has respect for blood been more fiercely enjoined...

The history of this people, as it is related in the Bible, continually stresses the prohibition against marriage with strangers. And in our day, just as it was thirty centuries ago, the vivacity of this racial exclusiveness is strengthened and can be measured by the rarity of mixed marriages between Jews and non-Jews.

It is indeed in this exclusive love of race, this jealousy of race one might say, that the profound meaning of Semitism is concentrated and in it appears its ideal expression. The race is an autonomous and homogeneous entity, which belongs to no territory, which does not accept the established laws of the countries where it dwells, and which energetically refuses the rich portions that might be brought to it by intermixture and crosses with other peoples. Without material support or external support it cares only for its unity. Its life is confined within itself and depends only on the vital power of its inward will, which pure and unalloyed, disdains and dismisses all contingencies of time and tide.

It is the formidable value thus conferred upon the race which alone explains this unique phenomenon full of contradictions : of all the numberless races only one, the Jewish people surviving its own past prolongs a paradoxical and illogical existence, and, in spite of all attacks, all dismemberments, all studied persecutions, imposes the blinding light of unity, the resplendent sign of eternity, the supremacy of the idea. A people has remained *one* for ever and despite everything¹.

Not being endowed with the necessary competence to discuss this opinion I shall confine myself to verifying the result, that is the present character of the Jews which alone concerns us here.

1. KADMI COHEN, *Nomades*, p. 26, 27, 28.

In the first place :

All those who had occasion to enter into contact with Jews or to have personal relations with them have been struck by the passion with which they enter into everything. This is what is called the *sombre fire of the Prophets*.

A special violence, eagerness, and acrimony enters into all their activities. Whether the question is of the arts or the sciences, domains in which serenity should reign, or business, and even more in politics, Jews immediately become overpassionate, never failing to impart their passion to the debate. This is so well-known, each day brings us so many living examples of this singular enthusiasm that it would be tiresome to insist further ¹.

This passionate enthusiasm of the race... explains... the phenomenon so often verified, of the *incoherence* of Arab and Jewish histories. It has indeed abolished in them the control and influence of logic which co-ordinates and regulates not only the whole of the facts constituting life, but even the succession of events composing history ².

Jewish history since the Dispersion is a veritable paradox ; a challenge to common sense.

To live for two thousand years in a state of permanent rebellion against all the surrounding populations, to insult their customs, their language and their religion by an uncompromising separatism, is a monstrosity. Revolt is sometimes a duty, dignity often commands it, but to accept it as a definite state, when it is so easy to allow oneself to become absorbed and thus avoid contempt, hatred and the opprobrium of twenty centuries is not to reason properly ; it is being illogical, it is madness ³.

The unity of the race, the individual *passionalism*, both influenced by the nomadic life, necessarily possess as corolla-

1. KADMI COHEN, *Nomades*, p. 33.

2. KADMI COHEN, *Nomades*, p. 53.

3. KADMI COHEN, p. 58.

ries, in the Semitic conception, the rejection of the principle of authority and a natural contempt for discipline ¹.

The principle of authority is among the Jews so incompatible with the deepest feelings of the race that the Bible goes as far as to give a divine origin to the prohibition against the establishment of royalty ².

While other civilisations were founding or have founded more or less lasting establishments on a principle of external authority sovereign in itself, the Semites have founded nothing in the way of permanent institutions ; having failed to understand or even to suspect the social strength and virtue of this principle, believing only in the principle of the intimate will of individuals grouped together ³.

Let us go further :

The *idea of authority* — and therefore the respect for authority — is an *anti-semitic notion*. It is in Catholicism, in Christianity, in the very teachings of Jesus that it finds at once its lay and its religious consecration ⁴.

If the respect, perhaps exaggerated, for the individual will was opposed among the Semites to the establishment and the extension of the principle of authority, it favoured on the other hand, naturally, the budding and blossoming of the idea of equality...

It is thus, that in Semitic hearts, to speak as ibn Khaldun, flourished like living realities, Liberty and Equality, these twin principles which, ever since have been no more than capital letters inscribed in the preambles of modern Constitutions and on the pediments of public buildings ⁵.

1. KADMI COHEN, p. 60.

2. KADMI COHEN, p. 62.

3. KADMI COHEN, p. 68.

4. KADMI COHEN, p. 70.

5. KADMI COHEN, p. 72.

The principle of human equality prevents the creation of social inequalities. Whence it is clear why neither Arabs nor the Jews have hereditary nobility ; why the notion even of « blue blood » is lacking. The primary condition for these social differences would have been the admission of human inequality ; the contrary principle, is among the Semites, at the base of everything.

The accessory cause of the revolutionary tendencies in Semitic history resides also in this extreme doctrine of equality. How could a State, necessarily organized as a hierarchy, subsist if all the men who composed it remained strictly equal?

What strikes us indeed, in Semitic history is the almost total lack of organized and lasting States... Endowed with all qualities necessary to form politically a nation and a state, neither Jews nor Arabs have known how to build up a definite form of government. The whole political history of these two peoples is deeply impregnated with indiscipline...

The whole of Jewish history... is filled at every step with « popular movements » of which the material reason eludes us. *Even more, in Europe, during the 19th and 20th centuries the part played by the Jews in all revolutionary movements is considerable. And if, in Russia, previous persecution could perhaps be made to explain this participation, it is not at all the same thing in Hungary, in Bavaria, or elsewhere. As in Arab history the explanation of these tendencies must be sought in the domain of psychology*¹.

A very lively sense of equality is then clearly one of the most characteristic aspects of the Semitic soul.

It would however be incomplete in this respect if we did not join to it, cause or consequence of this state of mind, the predominance of the idea of Justice².

Moreover and the offset is interesting, it is the idea of Justice, which in concurrence, with the *passionalism* of the

1. KADMI COHEN, 76, 77, 78, passage underlined by us.

2. KADMI COHEN, p. 81.

race, is at the base of Jewish revolutionary tendencies. It is by awakening this sentiment of justice that one can promote revolutionary agitation. Social injustice which results from necessary social inequality, is however, fruitful : morality may sometimes excuse it but never justice.

The doctrine of equality, ideas of justice, and *passionalism* decide and form revolutionary tendencies. Indiscipline and the absence of belief in authority favours its development as soon as the *object* of the revolutionary tendency makes its appearance. But the « object » is possessions : the object of human strife, from time immemorial, eternal struggle for their acquisition and their repartition. This is communism fighting the principle of private property ¹.

Even the instinct of property, moreover, the result of attachment to the soil, does not exist among the Semites — these nomads — who have never owned the soil and who have never wished to own it. Hence their undeniable communist tendencies from the days of antiquity ².

This passionate enthusiasm could take them far, up to the end : it could decide the disappearance of the race by a succession of deadly follies...

But this intoxication had its antidote, and this disorder of the mind found its corrective in the conception and practice of a positive utilitarianism... The frenzy of abstractions does not exclude the arithmetic of interest. Sometimes straying in Heaven the Semite does not, nevertheless, lose his belief in the Earth, in his possessions and his profits. Quite the contrary ! Utilitarianism is the other pole of the Semitic soul. — All, let us say, in the Semite is *speculation*, both of ideas and of business ; and in this last respect, what a lusty hymn has he not sung to the glorification of worldly interests ! ³

1. KADMI COHEN, p. 83.

2. KADMI COHEN, p. 85.

3. KADMI COHEN, p. 88.

The names of Trotsky and of Rothschild mark the extent of the oscillations of the Jewish mind ; these two limits contain the whole of the society, the whole of the civilisation of the 20th century ¹.

Let us sum up :

From the ethnical standpoint two kinds of Jews are usually distinguished : the Portuguese branch and the German branch (*Sephardim* and *Askenazim*).

But from the psychological standpoint there are only two kinds : the *Hassidim* and the *Mithnadgim*. In the *Hassidim* we recognize the Zealots. They are the mystics, the cabalists, the demoniacs, the enthusiasts, the disinterested, the poets, the orators, the frantic, the heedless, the visionaries, the sensualists. They are the Mediterranean people, they are the Catholics of Judaism, of the Catholicism of the best period. They are the Prophets who held forth like Isaiâh about the time when the wolf will lie down with the lamb, when swords will be turned into plough shares for the ploughs of Halexv, who sang : « May my right hand wither if I forget thee O Jerusalem ! May my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I pronounce not thy name, » and who in enthusiastic delirium upon landing in Palestine kissed the native soil and disdained the approach of the barbarian whose lance transfixed him. They are the thousands and thousands of unfortunates, Jews of the Ghettos, who during the Crusades, massacred one another and allowed themselves to be massacred to the sound of the ancient cry « Hear ye o Israel... » rather than forswear themselves or deny their God ; they are the innumerable victims and martyrs who line the road of humanity from the remotest times of barbarism towards a better age.

The *Mithnadgim*, are the Utilitarians, the Protestants of Judaism, the Nordics. Cold, calculating, egoistic, positive, they have on their extreme flank vulgar elements, greedy for gain without scruples, determined to succeed by hook or by crook, without pity.

1. KADMI COHEN, p. 156.

From the banker, the collected business man, even to the huckster and the usurer, to Gobseck and Shylock, they comprise all the vulgar herd of beings with hard hearts and grasping hands, who gamble and speculate on the misery, both of individuals and of nations. As soon as a misfortune occurs they wish to profit by it; as soon as a scarcity is known they monopolize the available goods. Famine is for them an opportunity for gain. And it is they, when the anti-Semitic wave sweeps forward, who invoke the great principle of the solidarity due to the bearers of the Torch...

This distinction between the two elements, the two opposite extremes of the soul has always been ¹.

1. KADMI COHEN, p. 129 130.

THE JEWISH RELIGION

To the study of the race must be added that of the religion for in Judaism the two ideas are inseparable.

Judaism presents a unique phenomenon in the annals of the world, of an indissoluble alliance, of an intimate alloy, of a close combination of the religious and national principles ¹...

There is not only an ethical difference between Judaism and all other contemporary religions, but also a difference in kind and nature, a fundamental contradiction. We are not face to face with a national religion but with a religious nationality ².

The idea of God, the image of God, such as it is reflected in the Bible, goes through three distinct phases.

The first stage is the Higher Being, thirsty for blood, jealous, terrible, war-like. The intercourse between the Hebrew and his God is that of an inferior with a superior whom he fears and seeks to appease.

In the second phase the conditions are becoming more equal. The pact concluded between God and Abraham develops its consequences, and the intercourse becomes, so to speak, according to stipulation. In the Talmudic Hagada, the Patriarchs engage in controversies and judicial arguments with the Lord. The Tora and the Bible enter into these debates and

1. G. BATAULT, *Le problème juif*, p. 65.

2. G. BATAULT, *Le problème juif*, p. 66.

their intervention is preponderant. God pleading against Israel sometimes loses the lawsuit. The equality of the contracting parties is asserted. Finally in the third phase the subjectively divine character of God is lost. God becomes a kind of fictitious Being. These very legends, one of which we have just quoted, for those who know the keen minds of their authors, give the impression, that they, like their readers, or their listeners, look upon God in the manner of a fictitious Being and Divinity, at heart, from the angle of a personification, of a symbol of the race¹.

This religion has a code : the Talmud.

1. KADMI COHEN, *Nomades*, p. 138.

THE TALMUD

The *Talmud* is the code of Jewish religious and social laws, the progressive deformation of the ancient Mosaic law, long since forsaken.

In course of time and from contact with external influences such as the religious doctrines of the Chaldeans, the priests who held in their hands the spiritual guidance of Israel (and especially the Pharisees) transformed little by little the law of Moses. Among others « the preachings of a whole line of prophets to the effect that Israel is the people chosen by God, became transformed into the conviction that Israel is the God-like people », and the promise of the rule of Jehovah changed itself into the idea of the domination of the world for the benefit of the Jews.

The Pharisees had always transmitted their teaching by word of mouth. One of the most remarkable of them, Judah the Holy, codified it by writing, about 190 A. D., the *Mishna*, which, with its annex the *Ghemara* (composed in the fifth century by the rabbi Joehanan) forms the *Talmud of Jerusalem*. The Sanhedrin, the Jewish government of the Dispersion, having been transported to Constantinople, there edited about the end of the fifth century the conclusions of the *Ghemara*, a revised and accentuated edition of the *Talmud of Jerusalem*, and since called the *Talmud of Babylon*. It was printed for the first time at Venice by Daniel Bomberg from 1520

to 1531 and aroused moreover a general indignation in the Catholic world.

The Talmud is very long and confused ; consequently a learned rabbi, Joseph Karo, composed at the beginning of the year 1500, a revised abridged, and clear edition called *Shulchan-Arukh*, and the reputation and authority of this work have remained unchanged. It has become *par excellence* the Judaic code for Jews of all countries.

The *sepher Ha Zohar*, or Book of splendour, contains the Jewish mysticism and gnosticism ; it is the modern expression of the Kabbala ¹.

When we speak of the Jewish religion we only think of the Bible, of the religion of Moses ; that is an illusion : the Jews of the Middle Ages were Talmudists ; they have not all ceased to be so. Even to-day the Talmud takes precedence in authority over the Bible. The *Archives Israelites* recognizes the absolute authority of the Talmud over the Bible and the *Univers Israélite* says :

During two thousand years the Talmud has been and still is an object of veneration for the Israelites of whom it is the religious code.

This religion creates men of business and revolutionaries because it is

essentially worldly,
exclusive,
Messianic.

1. The study of the Talmud is indispensable for the understanding of the Jewish question, but it would exceed our limits. See among others the summary of the question by Mgr JOUIN, *Le péril judéo-maçonnique*, t. V ; which contains moreover an important bibliography on the subject ; see also B. LAZARE, *L'antisémitisme* ; Werner SOMBART, *Les Juifs et la vie économique* ; G. BATAULT, *Le problème juif*, etc.

It is essentially worldly because it does not believe in the future life and promises happiness here below, whence there is logically an unbridled materialism and the cult of gold, the only creator of material enjoyments.

The foundation of Judaism, that which constitutes its master thought, that which makes its extraordinary originality, is its exclusiveness. The whole history of the Jewish people and of its religion, which is inseparable from it, gravitates round this central phenomenon.

A jealous God : Jehovah, his chosen people : Israel. The rites, the commandments, the law which unites them one with the other, there is the essence of all truth and all justice. Outside of these there is only the world and evil : the world of evil. This short-sighted but impassioned and singularly powerful view has made the integrity of a people during three thousand years. This unfailing exclusiveness has created a race, a nation, a religion, a mentality, which are without analogy in the history of the universe.

By the very strength of its own traditions, throughout the tempests which have tossed men during the centuries, Judaism has remained immovable, unalterably true to itself ; such as it was in its origin it is found to day. For the Jews constitute the most conservative of all peoples, they are the living demonstration of the all-powerfulness of a conservatism which never permits itself to be thrown down by never making concessions. Humanity changes, empires rise and fall, ideals spring up, flame, and die, the Jew remains, enveloped in his fierce exclusiveness, hoping everything from the morrow, tirelessly... super-human, inhuman.

I have already shown that the position of Jews in society, or rather on the edge of all society, proceeds from their exclusiveness ; to preserve themselves they must necessarily keep apart from a changing world ; to become assimilated would be for them renunciation, it would be consenting to disappear as the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Gauls and the Franks have disappeared ; their exclusive traditions preserve them from that. A landless

people, a wandering nation, a scattered race, they yet preserve a fatherland in their religion ; a common ideal animates them made from the same hopes always deceived and ceaselessly renewed. They remain thus, pursuing the mirage of a golden age, of a new era, of a Messianic time, when the world would live in joy and peace, obedient to Jehovah, submitting to his law, under the guidance of the sacerdotal race, chosen from all eternity, tempered by ordeals in expectation of this supreme hour.

But it happens that the people which, as I have said, is the most conservative among peoples, is also reputed, and justly reputed, to be possessed by a spirit of inextinguishable revolt. There is in that a paradox, or at least the appearance of a paradox, which I propose to clear away.

Prisoners of immutable traditions which are the essence of their exclusiveness, the Jews are among humanity, which is composed of an immense majority of non-Jews, for ever unable to adapt themselves.

Wherever it may be, whatever it may be, the established order is never founded, has never been founded, will never be founded upon the strict observance of the law of Jehovah, it will never be conformable to the dream of Israel. Judaism cannot but wish for its overthrow ; it is the duty of the Jew and above all his instinct, formed by traditions three thousand years old, to lend his hand for its destruction. Jewish exclusiveness commands and justifies the spirit of revolt ¹.

To this exclusiveness is added the Messianic doctrine which is largely derived from it. Jehovah promises to men happiness on earth by liberty, equality, justice ²; and — a capital point — the Jews believe that it is their mission to establish this age of happiness here below, the Messianic dream which makes them rebels in their very essence.

1. G. BATAULT, *Le problème juif*, Plon Nourrit, 1921, p. 103.

2. Justice as the Jews understand it would be the unification of the world under the Jewish law.

« Without the law, without Israel to practise it, the world would not exist, God would make it enter once more into nothingness : and the world will not know happiness until it is subjected to the universal empire of that law, that is to say, to the dominion of the Jews. Consequently the Jewish people is the people chosen by God as the trustee of His wishes and desires ; it is the only one with which the Divinity has made a pact, it is the elected of the Lord... » Israel is placed under the very eye of Jehovah ; he is the favourite son of the Eternal, he who has the right to his benevolence, to his special protection, and other men are placed beneath the Hebrews ; they have only the right through pity to divine bounty, since alone the souls of the Jews descend from the first man ¹.

This Happiness will be realized through liberty, equality and justice. However, if amongst the nations, that of Israel was the first which preached these ideas, other peoples, at various times in history have supported them, without being a race of rebels like the Jewish people. Why ? Because, if these peoples were convinced of the excellence of justice, equality and liberty, they did not hold their total realization to be possible, at least in this world, and consequently they did not work solely for that event.

On the contrary the Jew believed not only that justice, liberty and equality could be the sovereigns of the world, but they believed themselves specially sent to work for that reign. All the desires, all the hopes which these three ideas gave birth to ended by crystallizing round one central idea : that of the Messianic time, of the coming of the Messiah, who was to be sent by Jehovah to enthrone the power of earthly kingdoms ².

As for the final result of the Messianic revolution it will always be the same ; God will overthrow the nations and the kings and will cause Israel and its king to triumph ; the nations

1. B. LAZARE, p. 8.

2. B. LAZARE, p. 322, *op. cit.*

will be converted to Judaism and will obey the law, or else they will be destroyed, and the Jews will be the masters of the world ¹.

Whatever may be said, contemporary events ² again show the close parentage which unites Judaism with the spirit of revolt. Under various formulas it is always the same Messianic dream of the prophets and the psalmists which haunts the mind. Internationalism may be only an enlarged nationalism, a veritable ideological imperialism which dreams of placing in tutelage the nations brought under the ideal of justice obstinate and exclusive, which was that of Israel during the ages, and which has tormented the world for two thousand years. Setting aside human limitations, diversities, and imperfections despising the necessities of life and all tradition outside its own, the Messianic passion shaken by the spirit of revolt as by the blast of a tempest passes over the world laying waste all in its path. From the depths of a millenary past, crying out to the future, the voice of the prophets continues to thunder towards a world of justice where we shall see realized the haughty and impossible dream of Israel ³.

This race on which religion has impressed anti-social tendencies, is it organized with recognized chiefs whose authority extends over all the Jewish groups in the world ?

1. G. BATAULT, p. 135, *op. cit.*
2. Boshevism for example.
3. G. BATAULT, p. 155.

JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

There is no doubt that the Jews possess a well disciplined organization. It is almost impossible for a non-Jew to penetrate the secret details, but its external manifestations show a hidden authority and power which are undeniable.

Thus during a visit to Jerusalem, one of them, Chaim Weizmann, had said, speaking to the British authorities :

We shall have Palestine whether you wish it or not. You can hasten our arrival or retard it, but it would be better for you to help us, for, unless you do so, our constructive power will be transformed into a destructive power which will overturn the world ².

About the same period, in the United States, a Jew, B. M. Baruch, said to a committee of Enquiry of the American Congress :

I have probably had more power than any other man has had during the War.

And some have added.

He might have said : « We Jews had more power than you Americans had during the War », and it would have been true.

2. *Judische Rundschau*, n° 7, 1920 : see ROSENBERG's, *Der Staatsfeindliche Sionismus*, see also *Morning Post*.

In giving to this power the name of government we may be using a word which is open to question, but that makes no difference to the fact that the Jewish power does exist, that it overthrew Russia, and that it boasts of being able when necessary, to make the English and American governments comply with its wishes. The struggle of the Jews against President Taft in 1909 and the defeat of the latter show that this is not a groundless assertion.

Elsewhere, on several occasions, we have seen the Jewish Organizations set in motion the Jewish masses, and these movements have always been characterized by rapidity and mass action, thus proving that the Jews were solidly united among themselves by their organizations.

The chief Jewish organizations, more or less hidden, but nevertheless known with certainty are :

The Kahals and affiliated bodies such as the Jewish Committee of America.

The Alliance Israélite Universelle.

The Universal Order of the Bnaï Brith.

The Poale Zion.

Are there other organizations more occult than these ? We do not know. It is nearly certain that perquisitions at the centres of the above mentioned organizations would produce some interesting discoveries, but it is even more certain that no present government would dare to undertake them.

THE KAHAL.¹

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

The book on the Kahal by Brafman, is the chief and even the only source of our information. More than the *Talmud* and the *Schulchan Arukh*, and generally speaking the doctrinal works of the Jews, the *acts of the Kahal* are enveloped in mystery. They must remain secret and woe to him who dares to reveal them : he exposes himself to anathéma, excommunication and often death.

However J. Brafman had this audacity. Of Russian nationality and Jewish origin he became converted to Christianity at thirty four years old. He had long studied the social organization of the Jews in Russia and in 1858 he had presented to the Czar a memorandum on this subject. Having succeeded in being able to consult a considerable number of these acts of the Kahal he became thoroughly informed, and in 1870 published at Vilna, in Russian, his book on the *Kahal*. The impression produced was such that the government proposed to intervene against this occult jurisdiction of the Jews. But the Jews acted as they are wont to do in such circumstances. They obtained possession of nearly the whole edition and destroyed it. However a few copies escaped their vengeance and so permitted a French translation which appeared in 1873 Under the title *Libre du Kahal. Matériaux pour étudier le Judaïsme en Russie et son influence sur les populations parmi lesquelles il existe*, par J. Brafman, traduit par

1. This study of the Kahal is a summary of the work of. Mgr Jouin, *Le péril Judéo-maçonnique*, t. V, The part concerning the Kahal is denied by western Jews. The question may fairly be considered opened to discussion ; it is here offered for that purpose, hoping that some light will then be thrown on the subject.

T. P. Odessa, imprimerie L. Nitzsche, 1873. It is an Octavo, of four books and 256 pages divided into two parts. The first forms the work itself and contains 17 chapters and 93 pages only. The second is a valuable collection of acts of the Kahal. Brafman was able to examine about a thousand, and he published in entirety 285, which belong to the period 1795-18. This French translation has itself become almost unprocurable, and it was by good fortune that the *Revue Internationale des Sociétés secrètes* was able to have a copy photographed.

In the absence of the original work, another book may be consulted which has been so much inspired by it as to be almost a reproduction. This is the *Russie Juive* by Kalixt de Wolski, a work published in French by A. Savine in 1887 at Paris. Let us hasten to add moreover that this adaptation had the same fate as the book on the Kahal and that it is almost as rare.

It is by the book of Wolski that L. Vial was finally prompted to write the beginning of Chapter VII of the second part of his interesting study on *Le Juif sectaire ou l'intolérance talmudique* which appeared in 1889 published by M. Fleury in Paris. This gives an excellent and reliable summary of the question (Jouin t. V ; p. 91-92).

For the Jews we know that the Talmud is the law. The law finds its formula summed up in the *Schulchan Arukh* which represents the code.

It is a question of application. The daily practice of the law exacts, as in all societies, an executive and judicial power, which, among the Jews, belongs to a restricted group of magistrates. This ruling body is called the Kahal.

The Kahal is the assembly of the representatives of Israel. The institution dates from the most ancient times. It was already in force under the democratic system founded by Moses.

Later at the time of Christ, the Kahal had become, according to the expression of the *Jewish Encyclopedia*. « The centre of Jewish life ». Under the form of the Sanhedrim it was

the Kahal which dealt with affairs of state, not only from the religious and judicial points of view, but also in administrative and legislative questions.

In spite of its dispersion the Kahal did not lose either its authority or influence. The institution safeguarded by centuries of tradition retained its power. But it no longer worked in the full light of day and remained confined to the Ghettos. However in 1806 Napoléon 1st attempted to restore its glory by founding the Grand Sanhedrin of France to which was assigned the mission of regulating the social condition of Jews in reference to the judicial state of the various countries in which they were scattered. The Emperor was not long in perceiving that he had lacked foresight. He wished to limit the encroachments of Israel and he soon saw arrayed against him « that mysterious power of finance against which one cannot resist, even when one is Napoleon », as Léon Say once said in a speech from the Parliamentary tribune ¹.

THE KAHAL IN GENERAL

The Kahal possesses legislative and executive power. The Beth-Dine is the tribunal which assures respect for the administrative acts. Thus the Beth-Dine, although it represents the survival of the ancient Sanhedrim, is only the annex and complement of the Kahal. It is to the latter that sovereign authority belongs.

Every Kahal whatever its importance, comprises two kinds of members : the magistrates and dignitaries, that is to say the Kahal itself, and the subordinate staff :

The dignitaries constitute the Grand Council and enjoy a sovereign authority over the Jewish community of the region.

The Kahal is the regulator of Jewish life. Its rôle is in fact, in each district to take up the defence of the community. It

1. JOUIN, t. V, p. 90.

deliberates and ordains in the situations created by events. and decides what measures should be taken. Thus it enters into the daily life of every Jew, whom it directs, to some extent, in all circumstances.

It regulates religious, civil and commercial questions, the social hierarchy, etc ¹...

This discipline which the Kahal imposes on all members of the community is compensated by the care which it takes to protect their interests. This ever wakeful solicitude helps us to understand Jewish exclusiveness of which it is a manifestation. The vigilance of the Kahal in practical affairs is the complement of the anxiety which the rabbis showed throughout the ages to maintain the Judaic law above the nations. Israel refuses to be incorporated in the peoples which give it hospitality. It only accepts such of their customs as harmonize with its own tendencies.

For the rest it stands on guard not to allow the prerogatives which it has given to itself in the course of centuries, to be encroached upon. The Kahal is ceaselessly vigilant so that positions once gained should never be abandoned, and that advantages obtained should be perpetuated in spite of attempts which are made to reduce them to naught ².

THE BETH-DINE

The attributes of the Kahal are of an administrative order ; they concern above all the interests of the community. If it is a question of a law-suit, of litigation, of a crime, in a word, of a judicial or disciplinary matter, it is the Beth-Dine which deals with it. The Beth-Dine as we have already recalled corresponds to the Sanhedrim of ancient times. To-day however it no longer possesses the independance which it formerly claimed. It depends on the Kahal of which it represents only

1. JOUIN, t. V, p. 100.

2. JOUIN, t. V, p. 105.

the judiciary section. It is to this tribunal that the Israelites have recourse rather than to the courts of the country in which they reside.

The penalties pronounced by the Beth-Dine are of various degrees ; they consist above all in fines and material punishments. In grave cases anathema is pronounced against the delinquent ¹. This technical information is confirmed by a documented study of the Kahal of New-York which appeared in the *International Jew* ².

There are Jewish lodges, unions and societies whose names are well known to the public, and which seem to be the counterpart of similar groups among the non-Jewish population, but these are not the groups upon which to focus attention. Within and behind them is the central group, the inner government, whose ruling is law and whose act is the official expression of Jewish purpose.

1. Joux, t. V, p. 115.

2. In 1920 the *Dearborn Independent* the paper of Henry Ford, published a series of articles on the Jewish question. These articles which were supplied with documentary evidence and were calm in tone, had so much success that the newspaper at once obtained a very wide circulation. These articles were subsequently published as a book called the *International Jew*.

The Jews were deeply indignant, for the adversary was a serious one. They began a regular attack against Mr Ford. The struggle which lasted several years ended in 1927.

Mr Ford, in the midst of vast financial operations, attacked by the Jews in the American courts, and recently the victim of a serious motor accident, which was reported to have been somewhat mysterious, wrote to the Jewish organizations an open letter retracting all that he had published against the Jews.

The latter after allowing a certain time to pass in indecision accepted his excuses, and the actions in the Courts were stopped.

Although the personal retraction of Henry Ford does not diminish the intrinsic value of the evidence he published we give this extract under all reserve required in the circumstances.

Two organizations, both of which are as notable for their concealment as for their power are the New York Kehillah and the American Jewish Committee. By concealment is meant the fact that they exist in such important members and touch vitally so many points of American life, without their presence being suspected.

If a vote of New York could be taken to-day it is doubtful if one per cent of the non-Jewish population could say that it had ever heard of the New York Kehillah, yet the Kehillah is the most potent factor in the political life of New York to-day. It has managed to exist and mold and remold the life of New York, yet very few people are the wiser. If the Kehillah is mentioned in the Press, it is most vaguely, and the impression is, when there is any impression at all, that it is a Jewish social organization like all the rest.

The word « Kehillah » has the same meaning as « Kahal » which signifies « community », « assembly » or government. It represents the Jewish form of government in the dispersion. That is to say, since destiny has made the Jews wanderers of the earth, they have organized their own government so that it might function regardless of the governments which the so-called « gentiles » have set up. In the Babylonian captivity, in eastern Europe to-day, the Kahal is the power and protectorate to which the faithful Jew looks for government and justice.

The Peace Conference established the Kahal in Poland and Roumania. The Kahal itself is establishing its courts in the city of New York. The Kahal issues laws, judges legal cases, issues divorces — the Jew who appeals thereto preferring Jewish justice to the justice of the courts of the land. It is, of course, an agreement among themselves to be so governed...

The New York Kehillah is the largest and most

powerful union of Jews in the world. The centre of Jewish world power has been transferred to that city. That is the meaning of the heavy migration of Jews all over the world towards New York. It is to them what Rome is to the devout Catholic and what Mecca is to the Mohammedan. And by that same token, immigrant Jews are more freely admitted to the United States than they are to Palestine.

It is a strange and really magnificent spectacle which the Kehillah presents, of a people of one racial origin, with a vivid belief in itself and its future, disregarding its open differences to combine privately in a powerful organization for the social, material and religious advancement of its own race to the exclusion of all others.

ALLIANCE ISRAÉLITE UNIVERSELLE

The Alliance was founded by Crémieux in 1860. According to M. Buñmi it groups together the chief Masons of the world. Having under its orders all the Masonic, Martinist, Frankist and Zionist organizations it is like a Masonic Senate with an international influence.

The success of this institution is in great part due to the considerable sums at its disposal and which come from its rich members who endow it generously, in particular from the famous constructor of railways in the Balkans, the Jewish Baron Maurice Hirsch¹.

The Alliance Israelite has world-wide influence and to it is largely due the present League of Nations which is the Jewish realization of an idea pursued and demanded by them with insistence : indeed in 1864 the *Archives Israelites*, organ of the alliance, published a declaration of one of its members, Levy Bing, demanding the establishment of a supreme Jewish tribunal to judge disputes between the nations.

If little by little, said he, personal vengeance has disappeared, if it is no longer allowed to do justice oneself, but rather to turn to judgements generally accepted and disinterested in the litigation, is it not natural, necessary and far more

1. Gen. NETCHVOLODOFF, *Nicolas II et les Juifs*, Paris, Chiron, 1924, p. 125.

important to see shortly another tribunal, a supreme tribunal, vested with power to judge great public contentions, complaints between nations, giving final judgement, and whose word would be law? And that word is the word of God, pronounced by his eldest sons the Hebrews, and before which all nations would bow with respect, that is to say the universality of men, our brothers, our friends, our disciples ¹.

THE BNAI BRITH

The order of the Bnai-Brith is an order of international Freemasonry reserved exclusively for Jews (they demand to be admitted to all societies, but they nevertheless prohibit non-Jews from entering theirs).

It was founded in New York in 1813 but at present its headquarters are at Chicago.

It divides the world into 11 districts of which 7 are in the United States. The number of its lodges is about 500 with nearly a hundred thousand adherents.

The four members of its executive committee who do not live in the United States are respectively at Berlin, Vienna, Bucharest and Constantinople. There are lodges throughout the whole world. The names of the directors (at least those who are known) are the same as are to be found in all the great Jewish organizations, the same names which crop up again and again.

Nobody has cast doubt on the importance of the Bnai-Brith. When in 1909 the United States Government denounced the Commercial Treaty with Russia, President Taft, putting the interests of his country before Jewish interests at first resolutely opposed this rupture, but without success for he was speedily vanquished.

1. *Archives Israelites*, March 1864, pp. 310-350.

In order to show clearly that this sacrifice was mainly due to the Bnai-Brith the President presented it with the pen which had served to notify Russia of the denunciation of the treaty.

There is moreover no candidate for the Presidency of the great American Republic who does not court the friendship of this order. According to well informed sources there is in the Bnai-Brith a superposition of secret societies ending in a single governing power. Above the Bnai Brith are the Bnai Moshé, then the Bnai-Zion and finally the hidden centre of supreme command. I can only mention it without proof.

THE POALE ZION

Here is what a Jew says on this subject :

The Poale Zion societies have assigned to the Jewish proletariates the final aim of creating a Jewish socialist state in Palestine. The following are some extracts from the programme of the party :

Poale Zion works for the creation of a political and national centre in Palestine ; it extols an active struggle against the existing social order... Poale Zion adopts the programme of the international socialist party which, tends to the abolition of capitalist society and to the establishment of a socialist state... The party considers the establishment of a national and political centre in Palestine an essential condition for the existence and normal development of the Jewish people.

Poale Zionism pursues its task in Russia, Austria, Palestine and elsewhere.

At the present time it appears as the only international proletarian Jewish party. One of its fractions adheres to the

Communist International, the other to the Socialist International ¹.

Another party the « Bund » (union of Jewish workmen of Lithuania, Poland and Russia) had a similar programme but wished to see it realized in Russia and not in Palestine.

The rôle of these parties in Russia and Palestine before the Great War has been considerable. Actually the Bund, considering that its programme has been realized in Russia has become merged in the Communist and Menshevist parties of the U. R. S. S. R. ².

It does not seem an exaggeration to say that the Jews form a nation among the nations with powerful international organizations of which some are secret.

To conclude from this that these organizations are all under the sole direction of a hidden Jewish world government is hardly probable. If several manifestations of Jewish power (among others the Dreyfus affair, Jewish immigration into America after the War), have shown that there were international directions, on the other hand there are often in the bosom of Judaism violent disagreements.

I do not believe moreover that a sole central direction is needed to explain the unity of action of Judaism.

The religious exclusiveness, the solidarity of the race the community of mind and of interest are amply sufficient.

It is the revolutionary and Messianic aspiration of a whole people rather than a conspiracy rightly so called.

1. Elie EBERLIN, *Les Juifs d'aujourd'hui*, pub. Rieder, 1927, p. 24.

2. Elie EBERLIN, *Les Juifs d'aujourd'hui*, p. 25.

This tendency is thus summed up by Bernard Lazare :

The Jew is anti-social in a state based on Christian (or rather religious) principles but has society any other base ? ¹.

1. Bernard LAZARE, *Le Fumier de Job*. Paris, Rieder, 1928.

THE JEWISH PLAN OF ACTION

Have the Jewish organizations a general plan of action serving Jewish interests to the detriment of others ? If they have, what is it ?

It is difficult to know the exact programme of Jewish activity, but we are able to know its general line of conduct by observing the import of Jewish activity in the world and by studying the documents which we possess.

We have seen in the first part of our study of Judaism the meaning of its external activity. Let us now examine some documents. One of them had after the War an enormous and resounding publicity. The Protocols of the Elders of Zion.

Published for the first time in Russia by Serge Nilus in 1901, then about the same period by G. Butmi, a copy was deposited in the British Museum in London on 10th August 1906. This strange document at first passed unnoticed and was considered to be the work of the disordered brain of a visionary.

But when the War and Bolshevism had brought about the realization of that which was announced in the Protocols, these latter, in spite of many kinds of obstructions, found their way all over the world.

They are an exposition of the plan of world action of Judaism, a plan which is believed to have been stolen during a secret Zionist conference somewhere in Switzerland about 1897.

Here are the main lines :

1. There is and has been for centuries a secret political international organization of the Jews.
2. The spirit of this organization appears to be a traditional and eternal hatred of Christianity, and a titanic ambition to dominate the world.
3. The aim pursued throughout the ages is the destruction of National States and the substitution in their place of an international Jewish domination.
4. The method, employed at first to weaken and then to destroy the existing political bodies, consists in inoculating in them destructive political ideas. These ideas are summed up in the revolutionary principles of 1789.

Jewry remains sheltered from these corrosive ideas :
 « We preach liberalism to the Gentiles but on the other hand we maintain absolute discipline in our nation. »

These ideas are inculcated through the School, Freemasonry, the Press, the theatre etc.

The two first translators, Nilus and Butmi, published this document without commentaries and without furnishing any proof of authenticity.

Its success is due to its being clear and drawn up with dispassionate logic, to its giving an explanation of world chaos, and to the fact that the events predicted have come to pass.

Controversy has raged round the Protocols. If its defenders have not been able to prove its authenticity, its adversaries have been even less able to refute them ¹ ; we may thus conclude with the English historian Webster :

1. See the books of Mgr JOUIN, R. LAMBELIN, General NETCHVOLODOFF, Mrs WEBSTER, etc.

The truth is then that the Protocols have never been disproved and that the futility of the so-called refutations which have been published, as well as the fact of their temporary suppression, have done more to convince the public of their authenticity than all the anti-semitic writings on the subject put together.

The Protocols therefore continue to be a disturbing document, but since they cannot be regarded as having a proper historical origin, we shall leave them entirely aside. There are sufficient indisputable documents to show the line of action of Judaism, without having recourse to the Protocols.

If we consult Jewish literature we ascertain that it is difficult to open the book of any writer whether historian, sociologist, statesman, or man of letters, without finding in it this idea of world hegemony which haunts the minds of the Chosen People and impregnates their thoughts and their acts.

All agree upon the principle, only the form of this hegemony differs according to individuality, some conceive it as material, some as spiritual, others, and they are perhaps the most numerous, conceive it as both spiritual and material.

Let us quote among others Herzl, Asher Ginzberg, Alfred Nossig, Bernard Lazare, to take only the names of a few of the best known and most important among them. As Jean Maxé says speaking of the last named :

Nearly thirty years ago, in his extremely powerful book, which in spite of his aim, is more anti-Jewish than the most violent writings of anti-Semites the world over — because his book is true — Bernard Lazare duly warned us of the Jewish dream of universal domination. How right Daniel Lipman is when he says that these plans are not chimerical.

Bernard Lazare said :

An energetic, lively and extremely haughty people, considering itself superior to all other nations, the Jewish race wished to be a Power. It had an instinctive taste for domination, since, by its origin, by its religion, by its quality of a chosen people which it had always attributed to itself, it believed itself placed above all others. To exercise this sort of authority the Jews had not a choice of means, gold gave them a power which all political and religious laws refused them, and it was the only power which they could hope for. By holding this gold they became the masters of their masters, they dominated them and this was also the only way of finding an outlet for their energy and their activity ¹.

And elsewhere :

The emancipated Jews entered into the nations as strangers ... They entered into modern societies not as guests but as conquerors. They had been like a fenced-in herd. Suddenly the barriers fell and they rushed into the field which was opened to them. But they were not warriors... They made the only conquest for which they were armed, that economic conquest for which they had been preparing themselves for so many years ².

Thus, and it is still Bernard Lazare who speaks :

The Jew is the living testimony to the disappearance of the state which had as its basis theological principles, a State which anti-semitic Christians dream of reconstructing. The day when a Jew occupied an administrative post the Christian State was in danger : that is true and the anti-semites who say that the Jew has destroyed the idea of the state could more justly say that the entry of Jews into society has symbolized the destruction of the State, that is to say the Christian State ³.

1. B. LAZARE, *L'Antisémitisme*, Chailley, 1894.

2. B. LAZARE, p. 223.

3. B. LAZARE, p. 361.

Along with material domination there comes spiritual domination :

Jewish imperialism the only one which does not oppress, which on the contrary raises up ; which does not enslave but liberates ; which does not wound but heals ; Jewish imperialism which has its greatest expression in these lines of the Bible : 'The time must come, the time will come when our ideas will fill the whole world.

Our imperialism is the only one which can with impunity, defy the centuries, the only one which has not to fear defeat which without wandering from its path marches forward invincibly towards its goal with slow but firm tread ¹.

On this subject one of the leaders of Judaism, Alfred Nossig, provides us with distinct and valuable statements in his book *Integrales Judentum*. He says :

The Jewish community is more than a people in the modern political meaning of the word. It is the trustee of an historical world mission, I would even say cosmic mission, that its founders Noah and Abraham, Jacob and Moses, have confided to it...

That mission forms the unconscious kernel of our being, the common substance of our soul. .

The primordial conception of our ancestors was to found not a tribe but a world order destined to guide humanity in its development...

That is the true, the only meaning of the choice of the Hebrews as a Chosen People. They are not called to an outward glory, nor to a material domination of the world, but only to the accomplishment of this more arduous and sterner cosmic duty, which consists in working for the progress of the spiritual and moral development of humanity...

Gesta naturae per Judeos, this is the formula of our history. We must always repeat it again : we are not as our malignant

1. S. P. Chajes, member of the Massadole lodge affiliated to the Bnai Brith, *Almanach national juif*, years, 5682.

adversaries reproach us with being, a people which has in view the domination of the world in a material sense but a spiritual order destined to guide the development of humanity¹

Such then is the mission of Israel ; and the day of its accomplishment approaches.

We are emerging from a long dark night full of terror. Before us extends a gigantic landscape, the surface of the Globe : it is our way. Dark thunder clouds are still hanging over our heads. Hundreds among us still die everyday for our fidelity to the community. But already the time of recognition and of the brotherhood of peoples is approaching. Already on the horizon flames the dawn of *Our Day*².

Israel wishes then to bring about the happiness of humanity and believes itself on the eve of securing it. In principle these are fine sentiments ; but how does it propose to reach the goal ? A few pages further on Alfred Nossig teaches us : « It is universal socialism which represents this highest development of humanity towards which Israel must guide us ». Let us recall these words which we have already quoted.

The Mosaic system is socialism freed from utopias and from the terror of communism as well as from the *ascèse* of Christianity.

Present day world socialism forms the first stage in the accomplishment of the Mosaic doctrine, the beginning of the realization of the future state of the world announced by our prophets.

Thus he concludes :

1. A. Nossig, *Integrales Judentum*, p. 1-5, Berlin.
2. A. Nossig, p. 21.

If the peoples really wish to progress they must rid themselves of their mediaeval fear of the Jews ¹, and of the reactionary prejudices which they have against them. They must finally recognize in them what they are in reality ; the most sincere pioneers of the development of humanity.

The salvation of Judaism demands today that we acknowledge the programme of socialism, openly in the face of the world. The salvation of humanity depends for centuries to come on the victory of this programme.

And it is after the fearful Russian catastrophe, after the total failure of the socialist principle, failure confessed and recognized by the Bolsheviks themselves, that we are told this ! ²

Israel has had in Russia the opportunity to put into practice this socialism which is to secure the happiness of humanity. In a few years, almost in a few months, it destroyed what had required centuries to build up, it has produced a system of which the atrocity is without example in the world's history. I know that Nossig disapproves of terrorist methods, but all demagogic revolutions promised happiness without bloodshed and all ended, in varying degree, in orgies of massacre. And it is towards the socialism which Russia has experienced that Nossig, speaking in the name of Israel, wishes

1. We have seen how Sombart disposes of this historical allusion.

2. We always come back to the same misunderstanding. The Jews because of their spirit of revolt, their exclusiveness and the Messianic tendencies which animate them are in essence revolutionaries, but they do not realize it and believe that they are working for « progress ». The book of Bernard Lazare is typical in this respect. They wish happiness on earth through justice, but that which they call justice is the triumph of Jewish principles in the world of which the two extremes are plutocracy and socialism. Present day anti-Semitism is a revolt against the world of to-day, the product of Judaism.

to guide us, and he is surprized that we resist, and calls it « reactionary prejudice » !

What a danger for humanity there is in an entire people who propagate such principles of dissolution !

The following letter written by a Jew well known in English literary circles, Mr Oscar Levy, confirms in every point this opinion and replies to the theories of Nossig.

Shortly after the War, an English writer, G. Pitt-Rivers, published a book entitled *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution*. In it he shows the part of Jewish influence in Bolshevism and the world significance of this fact. Having sent the manuscript to a Jew, Mr Oscar Levy, the latter replied in a letter which Pitt-Rivers printed as preface to his book.

This letter is too long to reproduce in full ; the following are its principal passages.

No better title than *The World significance of the Russian Revolution* could have been chosen, for no event in any age will finally have more significance for our world than this one. We are still too near to see clearly this Revolution, this portentous event, which was certainly one of the most intimate and therefore least obvious, aims of the world-conflagration, hidden as it was at first by the fire and smoke of national enthusiasms and patriotic antagonisms.

You rightly recognize that there is an ideology behind it and you clearly diagnose it as an ancient ideology. There is nothing new under the sun, it is even nothing new that this sun rises in the East...

For Bolshevism is a religion and a faith. How could these half converted believers ever dream to vanquish the « Truthful » and the « Faithful » of their own creed, these holy crusaders, who had gathered round the Red Standard of the Prophet Karl Marx, and who fought under the daring guidance of these experienced officers of all latter-day revolutions — the Jews ?

There is scarcely an event in modern Europe that cannot be traced back to the Jews... all latter-day ideas and movements have originally sprung from a Jewish source, for the simple reason, that the Semitic idea has finally conquered and entirely subdued this only apparently irreligious universe of ours.

... There is no doubt that the Jews regularly go one better or worse than the Gentile in whatever they do, there is no further doubt that their influence, to-day justifies a very careful scrutiny, and cannot possibly be viewed without serious alarm. The great question, however, is whether the Jews are conscious or unconscious malefactors. I myself am firmly convinced that they are unconscious ones, but please do not think that I wish to exonerate them on that account... But there is in my firm conviction not the slightest doubt that these revolutionary Jews do not know what they are doing; that they are more unconscious sinners than voluntary evil-doers.

You have noticed with alarm that the Jewish elements provide the driving forces for both Communism and Capitalism, for the material as well as the spiritual ruin of this world. But then you have at the same time the profound suspicion that the reason of all this extraordinary behaviour may be the intense Idealism of the Jew. In this you are perfectly right.

Men and women of the Jewish Race; Haase, Levine, Luxemburg, Landauer, Kurt Eisner, the Prime Minister of Bavaria. From Moses to Marx, from Isaiah to Eisner, in practice and in theory, in idealism and in materialism, in philosophy and in politics, they are today, what they have always been: passionately devoted to their aims and to their purposes, and ready, nay, eager, to shed their last drop of blood for the realization of their visions.

« But these visions are all wrong », you will reply.

« ... Look where they have led the world to. Think, that they have now had a fair trial of 3.000 years standing. How much longer are you going to recommend them to us and to inflict them upon us? And how do you propose to get us out

of the morass into which you have launched us, if you do not change the path upon which you have led the world so disastrously astray ? »

To this question I have only one answer to give, and it is this : « You are right ». This reproach of yours, which — I feel it for certain — is at the bottom of your anti-Semitism, is only too well justified, and upon this common ground I am only too willing to shake hands with you and defend you against any accusation of promoting Race Hatred : If you are anti-Semite, I, the Semite, am an anti-Semite too, and a much more fervent one than even you are...

We (Jews) have erred, my friend, we have most grievously erred. And if there was truth in our error 3,000, 2,000, nay, 100 years ago, there is now nothing but falseness and madness, a madness, that will produce an even greater misery and an even wider anarchy.

We who have promised to lead you to a New Heaven, we have finally succeeded in landing you into a New Hell... There has been no progress, least of all moral progress... And it is just our Morality, which has prohibited all real progress, and — what is worse — which even stands in the way of every future and natural reconstruction in this ruined world of ours... I look at this world, and I shudder at its ghastliness, I shudder all the more as I know the spiritual authors of all this ghastliness...

But its authors themselves are unconscious in this as in all they are doing.....

Their eyes are closed to the miseries, their ears are deaf to the moanings, their heart is hardened to the anarchy of Europe : they only feel their own sorrows, they only bewail their own fate, they only sigh under their own burdens.

On the other hand René Groos wrote under the title : *La question juive*, par un Juif :

On the 11th november Germany was obliged to lay down her arms and to declare herself vanquished. It had cost France sixteen hundred thousand dead, the sacrifice of her finest

blood, of her most ardent youth... It is not certain that such a sacrifice served any purpose...

If we do not take care the vanquished of yesterday, triumphant to-day, will be the victors of to-morrow...

The two internationals of Finance and of Revolution, are working for it with zeal — the two faces of the Jewish International.

The criminals have thrown off the mask with too much impudence, in too many countries at the same time ; the conflagration in Russia has lit up the crime with flames which are too high and bright. There is a Jewish conspiracy against the nations, and first of all against France, against the principle of order which she represents in the world. This conspiracy occupies more or less everywhere the avenues of power.

In France it reigns indeed...

Was I wrong to speak of a Jewish reign ? Although less apparent than in Russia or Hungary it is none the less real ¹.

To sum up after having reviewed a certain number of various Jewish texts, it is logical to conclude :

That whether the Protocols are true or false matters little. If the observation of events actually taking place in the world is not sufficient to inform us, there are enough indisputable Jewish writings to show us this :

The Jewish idea of world domination exists. This idea does not remain in an abstract state, but is being actually realized under our eyes in the material domain and above all in the spiritual domain by means of the world revolution. Judaism with its annex Free Masonry, is at the bottom of this revolutionary movement.

It would certainly be an exaggeration to say that it created this movement in its entirety, but whatever may have been the part of its influence in the creation, it benefits from it more than any one and impels it forward

1. *Nouveau Mercure*, May 1927.

with all the compact strength of its powerful organization.

It is indisputable that without the help of Free Masonry and of Judaism this movement would probably never have succeeded in taking shape and would certainly not have succeeded in implanting itself in the whole world.

CONCLUSION.

There remain two points in the Jewish question to be cleared up :

1. Is the world movement of revolutionary destruction upheld by the Jews as a body? Yes or no? Or in other words, what is the proportion of good Jews and bad Jews ?

2. Is this work of destruction conscious or not ? With this question as a corollary : Is the revolutionary movement and its offspring, Jewish domination, the result of a Judaeo-Masonic conspiracy, or simply the natural consequence of modern principles installed since 1789 ; materialism and atheism in the spiritual domain, liberalism, democracy and republic in the political domain, collectivism in the social domain ?

There are powerful Jewish and Masonic revolutionary forces in the world. These forces, as we have seen, are organized and directed internationally : so they may be termed a conspiracy. To conclude from this that Jewry forms a compact revolutionary army, directed by a single supreme chief, would be absurd. What is the proportion of those who are in the conspiracy, we do not know. All Jews are not Bolsheviks, all Masons are not revolutionary atheists, but nevertheless every Jew because of his Judaic mentality and every Mason because of his

Masonic mentality is in essence an unconscious revolutionary.

It is the exclusiveness, the fierce monotheism, the jealous intolerance, and the pestering irritation of the law which have shaped Jews and which have secured for them a bitter perpetuity ; it is the uncompromising tradition which has maintained the nationality and to a certain extent created the race, which cannot be assimilated and which seems to defy history and time.

The instinctive opposition of the Jews to every established order is the direct consequence of their age-long effort to maintain the immutability of their ideal and the constancy of their original traditions. The spirit of revolt inherent in Judaism is of a quite negative quality, it works in the heart of nations to dissolve all religions, political, and social forms, and perpetually aims at destroying from a selfish instinct of self-preservation.

It is thus that the people, normally the most conservative, can always claim to march in the van of « Progress », by offering its co-operation to the so-called *advanced* parties, to the discontented of all kinds, who for various motives aim at overthrowing the existing order with the idea of substituting another which is by definition preferable.

Social struggles which, in final analysis, lead back to the strife between the rich and the poor, are a common historical phenomenon seen in all times and places in varying intensity ; when they are prolonged, become embittered, and reach a paroxysm they inevitably bring about the ruin of states and the disappearance of nations.

Judaism, with the people in which it is incarnated, must, to maintain its spiritual and material integrity, favour and keep up among the nations this murderous strife between the classes which in the long run always serves its purpose. In the mind, and above all, in the instinct of the Jew, such as history has constituted them, this strife, which is a powerful means, of dissolution, is working to secure the final triumph of the Chosen People and the coming of the Messianic Age. One might

deduce from Israel the veritable metaphysics of the eternal revolution ¹.

These words are confirmed by those of a Jew, Eberlin :

The more thorough a revolution is, the more liberty and equality are gained for Jews. Each current of progress never fails to consolidate the position of the Jews. In the same way each recoil, each reaction hits them in the first place. A simple movement to the right in politics is often enough to expose Jews to a boycott, to the *numerus clausus* etc. In this way the Jew is the pressure gauge of the social boiler.

Thus in so far as it is an entity, the Jewish nation cannot place itself on the side of reaction, for reaction, that is to say a return to the past, signifies for the Jewish people abnormal conditions of existence ².

Is Jewish influence then unconsciously or rather instinctively revolutionary? Without neglecting the role of Jewish organizations having a definitely destructive aim, it seems probable that the part of this unconsciousness is more considerable than is believed.

The Jews, in so far as they are an entity, are then in essence revolutionaries ; whether they are so unconsciously or instinctively does not alter the fact nor the danger of it.

A book like that of Alfred Nossig is very remarkable from the spirit of Jewish national and religious fervour which animates it. We feel in it the profound and absolute conviction of the great destiny which awaits the Jewish people, called to the spiritual guidance of the world.

The author, whose every sentence breathes sincerity and Jewish patriotism, sees only the greatness of Israel ; an inevitable greatness, of divine origin, a supernatural

1. G. BATAULT, *Le problème juif*, p. 255.

2. E. EBERLIN, *Les Juifs d'aujourd'hui*, p. 201.

force which carries away the Jews themselves in the unconscious movement to which the world must submit as to a law of nature. This kind of patriotism has its nobility, its wild and fanatical grandeur which recoils from no means, no destruction to accomplish the ideal which animates it. That would prove that the Jews do not destroy with the deliberate intention of harming, but that they thus apply, instinctively, their power to the march towards Jewish spiritual and material domination of the world. It is regrettable that this domination should make necessary the spiritual, and to some extent, the material, disintegration of non-Jewish humanity.

The work of Nossig helps to show us that socialism is the sometimes unconscious expression of Jewish mentality in the world ; it is quite possible, but it does not prevent socialism being for us a destructive element, and it is difficult to sustain the opinion that in trying to defend ourselves we are acting as anti-Semites because in doing so we are thus going against Jewish mentality.

It is absolutely logical that in the democratic system the Jews should rapidly become the only masters ; and it is not less logical that, this having been accomplished, they should impose upon the world their way of thinking and of acting, and that they should use this situation to favour their interests at the expense of those of the Gentiles, (all the more as they consider that they have arrears to make up). It is our duty not to allow such a state of things to become established.

Here a question must be asked.

Can we blame the Jews because they are working for the greatness of their race ?

To that I should reply without hesitating : No ; not more than we reproach an Englishman or a German with working for the greatness of his country.

There is indeed much that is beautiful in the fervour

and conviction of this Jewish patriotism. It is for us to take the necessary measures and not for them to change their aim. There would be no question moreover if there was not this difference that English and Germans are known as such and do not hide the fact that they are before everything English or Germans and consequently are adversaries. But the Jews take advantage of their false naturalization as citizens in order to work without hindrance for the future of Judaism to the detriment of the countries which accord them hospitality. They benefit then from the advantages of this situation without fulfilling its duties.

On the other hand, if the Jewish world hegemony signified the moral and material elevation of humanity, it would have no adversaries ; but it implies the moral, and in part material destruction of the nations for the benefit of the Jew alone. Thus anti-Judaism is a work of defence and social conservation, not an act of aggression, as the Jews would wish to make us believe :

In summing up we may therefore say this :

Jewish domination is the result of both natural causes and conspiracy. On the one hand, it is the logical consequence of modern principles, but on the other hand, the origin and the putting in practice of these principles are due to the Judaeo-Masonic conspiracy of which we have seen the efforts to establish in the world the principles of 1789 : in the spiritual domain by atheistic materialism ; in the political domain, by democracy, republicanism and liberalism ; in the social domain by collectivism.

It would then be a service to the Jews themselves to check their revolutionary activity, for on the one hand, their famous socialism is not likely to last, and on the other hand, if we are the first to succumb to it, their own turn will come immediately after, since, in short, their abilities are essentially those of parasites. History demonstra-

tes that, left to themselves, they have always been incapable of building up or directing their own States.

Warnings have not been lacking however for us. We know what Dostoïevsky said in the *Journal d'un Ecrivain* about 1880. We have quoted elsewhere a part of the impressive prophecy of Copin-Albancelli. Here is the opinion of a less known author Wilhelm Marr.

Wilhelm Marr was a German revolutionary who for many years carried on a determined campaign against Christianity and took an active part in the revolution of 1848. He saw in what followed that Israel alone had gained, and, in 1879, he published a book, entitled *La Victoire du Judaïsme sur le Catholicisme* in which he said :

I declare aloud without the least intention of irony, the triumph of Judaism in world history ; I publish the account of the lost battle, of the victory of the enemy who shows no pity to the conquered army...

In this country of thinkers and philosophers, the emancipation of the Jews took place in 1848. From that date began the thirty years war which Judaism now openly carries on against us...

We Germans pronounced in 1848 our official renunciation for the benefit of Judaism...

From the very moment of their emancipation, the Jews have become for the Germans a subject upon which it is forbidden to touch...

At the present hour, Russia alone among all the States of Europe, still offers resistance to the official recognition of the foreign invasion. It is the last rampart against which the Jews have dug their last sap, and to judge from the trend of events, the capitulation of Russia is only a question of time...

In this immense Empire... Judaism will find the « Archimedean fulcrum » which will permit it to drag finally from its hinges the whole of Western Europe.

The elastic spirit of intrigue of the Jews will plunge Russia in a revolution, the like of which the world has probably never seen...

In Russia Judaism occupies such a situation that it is still in dread of being driven back. When it has laid Russia low, it will fear the attacks of no one ; when it takes possession, in Russia, of all the functions of the State, just as with us, then the Jews will officially set about the destruction of society in Western Europe, and this «last hour» of condemned Europe will strike at the latest, in a hundred or a hundred and fifty years, seeing that events are now developing, much more quickly than during the preceding centuries.

GENERAL CONCLUSION.

The aim of this work has been to show the revolutionary influence of two powers which are generally little known. But it is not because they have been hitherto unknown to the public that we should permit ourselves to fall into the contrary exaggeration and accuse them of being the only cause of the evil.

Briefly we may state in its main lines the following conclusion :

The revolution has many and various causes : some are normal and well-known — industrialism, over-population, lack of general well-being, universal anarchy due to the disappearance of all spiritual power — and have been sufficiently described by others. To deal with them would be to exceed the limits of this work. All that we shall say about them is that they have produced a general uneasiness, which has been exploited by a certain category of persons and organizations in order to spread revolution, and which has been created, in case of need, when it did not already exist.

There is a greater amount of artificiality in revolution than is believed. This is not solely to be imputed to the Jews. It is not certain that they form its most numerous elements, but, thanks to their racial qualities, they are the strategists and the directors of the movement from which they almost alone derive advantages.

The Jews are not attacked because they are Jews.

We should not dream of being alarmed by their material and, above all, moral expansion if it did not inevitably entail our own destruction. They are always crying out about persecution but in this case who is the persecuted party ? If they call the fact of our defending ourselves against them anti-Semitism, then there are in the world many people who are unconsciously anti-Semites. The responsibility rests with us not with them. The powers of evil have always existed. It is true that since the 18th century they have grouped and organized themselves internationally, and that they have at the same time, taken a more insidious form : destruction by means of ideas. Nevertheless, so long as States followed the two guiding lines of absolute monarchy by divine right and of religion, the powers of evil were unable to prevail against them ; on the day when they abandoned those principles these powers triumphed.

Socialism and democracy are the greatest snares of modern times. This is sufficiently asserted by revolutionaries themselves. As for the republican form of government, so extolled to-day, it would be quite tenable in theory if it did not inevitably fall under the Judaeo-Masonic domination. Judaeo-Masonry does not hide this, moreover, since it admits openly that it preaches the republic in order to seize power more easily and to have a free field. That is why Judaeo-Masonry dreads above all an absolute power which alone can bar its road.

The gravity of the present situation is not in the material ravages caused by revolution, it is in the democratic, materialist and revolutionary state of mind which reigns to-day and influences every one, consciously or unconsciously. It is the Jewish mentality which has invaded the world, and Judaism only became a destructive element when we allowed ourselves to be impre-

gnated with it. This last point cannot be too strongly emphasised.

The Jewish problem is a prohibited subject, of which it is forbidden to speak, but the situation is too grave for us to remain silent. It is inadmissible that we should quietly let our brothers of Russian race be butchered without doing anything to defend them.

We have seen what Judaism has done with Russia. A similar fate threatens us all. Only the means differ according to countries. In Russia it is Bolshevism; in France it is slow disintegration through the Judaeo-Masonic republic. In England and America it is ever-growing penetration and influences in all Classes and in Government; elsewhere other means are employed, but the aim, the triumph of the revolution — with its consequence: the material and spiritual domination of Judaism — is the same everywhere.

The first phase of the defensive struggle is then to throw the full light of day on the Judaeo-Masonic question. If, as they maintain, the Jews and the Masons are perfectly innocent, they should be the first to wish for a public elucidation for which, up to the present, they have never sought.

After that it would be necessary to take defensive measures; such measures need not be violent. It would be for those competent to define them.

Actually there is only one really important question in the world, and that is the fight against the revolution and above all against the revolutionary idea. It is an international question, and a narrow chauvinism must not be permitted to prevent the indispensable union of all healthy elements in the world against the common enemy.

It is for us a question of life or death. Time presses, for the longer we delay the more the ruins will accumulate.

How can we fight against the revolutionary danger ?

Let us indicate only the general line to follow :

In continental Europe — It is necessary to act simultaneously both in a direct and indirect manner — the latter being the more efficacious.

In an indirect manner by converting ourselves instead of converting the adversary.

To achieve this we must in the first place abandon the deadly principles of 1789 which the Jews and Masons have inculcated in us, we must give up parliamentarism, demagoguery and atheism regarded as a state religion ; we must return to traditions, to absolute monarchy, to religious principles compulsorily taught in the schools, to the social hierarchy, to all that puts a check on the one hand, on the blind forces of popular destruction, and on the other hand, on the unlimited power of gold ; in so doing we may perhaps free ourselves from this brutalizing present day economic mentality of Jewish origin : business and gold the supreme aim of existence to the detriment of all culture, all beauty, all moral elevation. Then the social organism will become normal again and the Judaeo-Masonic microbe will be powerless against it.

The question is international. It is a struggle between two diametrically opposed civilizations. One or the other of them will triumph or perish in the world. Ideas are not divided by water-tight partitions. There cannot exist permanently side by side a materialistic Socialist civilization in Moscow and a Christian civilization in the west ; one of the two principles must triumph.

The theory which consists in propagating revolution in neighbouring countries in order to weaken them at the benefit of one's own is suicidal. Germany has had bitter experience of it. It is ominous to record that conservative governments could applaud the success of the Russian

revolution and that, even to-day, they do not consider the danger of Bolshevist contamination more serious than that of commercial or military rivalry. We may note on this subject the clear sightedness of the Netherlands minister whose report on Bolshevism we have quoted in an Earlier page.

All other considerations should be subordinated to the fight against the revolutionary spirit. I am one of those who believe that only an absolute monarchy can fight it successfully and that it is necessary to support the establishment or re-establishment of monarchy in whatever country it may be. Sociologists and philosophers tell us that political forms are the simple manifestation of the mentality of the people and that to begin the work of reform in the political sphere is to put the cart before the horse, to start from consequences and not from principles, and to build on sand.

I do not entirely share that opinion for two reasons : Firstly, monarchy is not only a political form ; it almost inevitably implies a whole political, social and religious system which is opposed both in spirit and by interest to revolutionary principles. The hatred of revolutionaries for monarchy shows that they fully realize this. Secondly, the mentality of a people is not a spontaneous product. It is moulded and created by various means, of which the School and the Press are the two principal ones. Therefore it is first of all necessary to become master of these two factors of public opinion. The political question is then the method of reaching the essential principles of which religion forms the basis, for Christian religion and tradition have been for two thousand years the power which has held civilized society together in the western world.

Simultaneously we must act directly by taking defensive measures against Free Masonry and Judaism.

Against Free Masonry ?

It is fairly simple. It is sufficient to prohibit all secret societies. By acting thus we do not destroy it but prevent it doing harm. Mussolini and the Hungarian government were the first to act thus. Their example will certainly be followed.

To defend ourselves against Judaism is much more difficult. Some people, and not the least important, consider the problem insoluble. No perfect solution exists, that is to say, one which efficaciously protects the Gentiles without harming the Jews. The only truly efficacious solution would be the definitive extermination of the Jews or the non-Jews. It is useless to dwell on this solution, let us turn to others.

Assimilation ? From the very essence of Judaism it is impossible, the history of the Jewish people testifies to that.

Take away from the Jews their civil and political rights ? That would be a half measure both profoundly exasperating and insufficient to protect us efficaciously. Do not let us forget that we have to protect ourselves against the Judaic spirit as much as against individuals. Moreover that would not be a measure against Jewish financial power.

Zionism ? That is to say give the Jewish race a country of its own.

That would be probably the most just and best solution. But is it practically possible ? We may doubt it. In any case the Jews do not wish it at any price, or rather they wish it, but understood in the following fashion :

The new Judea moreover would not contain the whole of the Jews ; the majority of them would continue to sojourn in the land of their adoption, but they would receive from the

common home the necessary impulsion, the creation of a Jewish centre would give them back life and unity.

That is in all its purity the dream of present day Zionists.

Commenting upon these words G. Batault says :

If such is the whole dream of Zionism, if that were really Zionism, it would appear to be a veritable plot against the Gentiles, against the nations, and it would justify as a reaction of defence against it the counter-plots and counter-attacks of anti-Semitism. What, in fact, would those Jews constitute, who would continue to sojourn in their land of adoption but who would receive their necessary impulsion from the common home centre, except a permanent conspiracy against the safety of States ?...

If the reconstituted Jewish people wishes to rank itself as a nation among the nations, then it is the duty and the interest of each one to help it to do so. If it contemplates, on the contrary, organizing itself internationally in order to ruin and dominate the nations, then it is the duty of the latter to rise up and forbid it.

It is moreover permissible to doubt whether the Jews could prosper as a nation on their own territory with a national government. Their primitive abilities developed by 3.000 years of heredity, have made of them a race marvellously apt at utilizing what others produce, but rarely capable of original production ; and that is so in all branches. The day when instead of living upon others the Jews will only have themselves to depend on, they will find it very disagreeable ¹. Moreover the spirit of revolt, inherent in Judaism, not being able to exercise itself against Gentile Governments will turn against its

1. A writer having at the beginning of Zionism, expressed this idea : « The Jews will not remain in Palestine for there is no one there to exploit », was covered with abuse by the Jewish press.

ownself. However, that is their business, and it would only be just that they should utilize their destructive abilities between themselves after having so long directed them against Christians. Zionism could be a touchstone for honest Judaism. If the Jews are what they say, then they ought to accept with gratitude the offer of a reconstitution of their nation. If they do not wish it, then the anti-Semites are right, and it is necessary to take defensive measures without delay.

In fact, and for many reasons, the first attempt of Zionism in Palestine has failed, but that does not prove that the idea is bad. That the Jewish problem bristles with difficulties is beyond doubt, but it is not by practising the policy of the ostrich and by ignoring it that we shall be able to solve it. By continuing thus we shall come to the following result : There will be a momentary triumph of the Revolution either in a violent form as in Russia, or in a slow form as in France. The consequence will be a first realization of Jewish world hegemony. This will all be followed by a reaction against the inevitable abuses of the Jews and by a wave of anti-Semitism in a form more violent than the world has yet seen. The second part of the programme is in preparation in Russia and in the Zone of Eastern Europe which has tasted Jewish domination. And the final result means destruction on each side.

In the English speaking countries conditions are more favourable than in Continental Europe for materially checking the present unceasing growth of the danger. Taking the case of England and noting that what has to be said of the situation there applies also in great part to America — it has to be recognized, as a starting point, that the great mass of the British people are ignorant of the very existence of a Jewish question ; and are also ignorant of the fact that there is a strict censorship

over them as to what they can read on this and certain related subjects. It can be claimed that what is contained in this book is evidence enough that there is a Jewish question, and a very serious one too, even for England; but the ignorance of the people generally makes the first obstacle to any programme for meeting the danger. To get over this one must defy the censorship over newspaper and book publishing, over news agencies, over important sections of film and play production, and over many politicians.

The first and immediate aim is then to overcome the systematic obstruction made to any divulcation of the real state of things. The problem must be laid down before the country and openly discussed. England does not lack competent men who will then advise what to do.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ENGLAND

- John ROBISON. — *Proof of a conspiracy.*
W. J. HUGHAN. — *Constitution of the Freemasons of the premier grand lodge of England.* 1899.
A. GINZBERG. — *Transvaluation of value.*
Morning Post. — *The cause of the world unrest.* 1920.
G. Pitt RIVERS. — *The World significance of the Russian revolution.* 1920.
Dr E. J. DILLON. — *The inside story of the peace conference.*
N. H. WEBSTER. — *World Revolution.* 1922.
— *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements.* 1924.
— *The Socialist Network.* 1927.
Hilaire BELLOC. — *The Jews.*
DARGON. — *The Nameless Order.*
Chas. M. ROUSE. — *The Nameless Beast.*

FRANCE

- LUCHET (Marquis de). — *Essai sur la secte des Illuminés.* 1789.
ROBISON (John). — *Preuve d'une conspiration contre les Rois et les religions* (traduit). 1798.
BARRUEL (Abbé). — *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme.* 1804.
ECKERT. — *La Franc-Maçonnerie dans sa vraie signification* (traduit). 1852.
CRÉTINEAU-JOLY. — *L'Eglise romaine en face de la Révolution.* 1859.

- LECOUTEUX DE CANTELEU (Comte). — *Les sectes et sociétés secrètes, politiques et religieuses, essai sur leur histoire depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la Révolution française.* 1863.
- GOUGENOT DES MOUSSEAUX. — *Le Juif, le Judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples.* 1869.
- DESCHAMPS (P.). — *Les Sociétés secrètes et la Société.*
- DESCHAMPS (P.) et A. JANET. — *Histoire des sociétés secrètes.*
- JANET (Claudio). — *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la Révolution.*
- LEMANN (Abbé). — *L'entrée des Israélites dans la société française.*
— *La prépondérance juive.* 1889.
- COCHIN et CHARPENTIER. — *La campagne électorale de 1789 en Bourgogne.*
- DILLON (Mgr Georges-F.). — *La guerre de l'antechrist contre l'Eglise et la civilisation chrétienne.*
- LAZARE (Bernard). — *L'antisémitisme.* 1894.
- BRAFMAN (J.) — *Le livre du Kahal* (traduit). 1873.
- KALIXT DE WOLSKY. — *La Russie juive* (traduit). 1887.
- ROHLING (A.). — *Le Juif Talmudiste.* 1878.
- LAMARQUE (Abbé de). — *Le Juif talmudiste.* 1888.
- LOMBARD DE LANGRES. — *Histoire des Sociétés secrètes.*
- BORD (G.). — *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France, des origines à 1815.* 1908.
- COPIN ALBANCELLI. — *Le drame maçonnique, le pouvoir occulte contre la France.* 1908.
— *La conjuration juive contre les peuples,* 1909.
- LE FORESTIER. — *Les Illuminés de Bavière.* 1914.
- DELASSUS (Mgr). — *Le problème de l'heure présente.*
— *La conjuration antichrétienne.* 1910.
- TORMAY (C. DE). — *Le livre proscrit.* 1909.
- JOUIN (Mgr). — *Le péril judaéo-maçonnique.* 5 vol. 1919-1927.
- LAMBELIN (R.). — *Le règne d'Israël chez les Anglo-Saxons,*
— *L'impérialisme d'Israël.*
- REZANOF (Colonel). — *La troisième internationale communiste, le Komintern. — L'idéologie du communisme.*
- GROOS (René). — *Enquête sur le problème juif,* 1920.
- BATAULT (G.). — *Le problème juif.* 1921.

- J.-J. THARAUD. — *Quand Israël est roi.*
 — *Causerie sur Israël.*
- SOMBART (Werner). — *Les Juifs et la vie économique.* 1923.
- LEBEY .***. (A.). — *Dans l'atelier maçonnique.*
- MICHEL (G.). — *La dictature de la Franc-Maçonnerie sur la France.* 1924.
- PREUSS (A.). — *Etude sur la Franc-Maçonnerie américaine.*
- NETCHVOLODOFF (A.). — *Nicolas II et les Juifs.* 1924.
- COCHIN (A.) — *Les sociétés de pensée et la révolution en Bretagne.* 1924.
- SOKOLOFF (Nicolas). — *L'enquête judiciaire sur l'assassinat de la famille impériale de Russie.* 1924.
- BÉRAUD (H.). — *Ce que j'ai vu à Moscou.* 1925.
- LANTOINE .***. (A.). — *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie française.*
 — *Hiram couronné d'épines.* 2 vol , 1926.
 — *Hiram au jardin des oliviers.* 1928.
- MARTIN .***. (G.). — *La Franc-Maçonnerie française et la préparation de la révolution.* 1925.
- GUÉNON (R) — *La crise du monde moderne.* 1927.
 — *Le Théosophisme.* 1924.
- IZOULET (J.). — *Paris, capitale des religions.* 1927.
- MOLLE. — *Le front unique.* 1927.
- MELGOUNOV (S.-P.). — *La terreur rouge.* 1927.
- GAUTHEROT (G.). — *Le monde communiste.* 1927.
- ELIE-ÉBERLIN. — *Les Juifs d'aujourd'hui.* 1927.
- Edmond FLEG. — *Pourquoi je suis Juif.* 1928.
- Raymond DUGUET. — *Un bain en Russie soviétique.* 1928.
- E. PLANTAGENET .***. — *La Franc-Maçonnerie française.* 1928.
- R. MENNEVÉE .***. — *L'organisation anti-maçonnique en France* 1928.
- X. — *L'élue du dragon.* 1929.
- KADMI-KOHN. — *Nomades.* 1929.

UNITED STATES

- FORD (H.). — *The International Jew.* 4 vols. 1920.
- Ludwig LEWISOHN. — *Israël.* New-York. 1925.

GERMANY

- ECKERT. — *Der Freimaurerorden in seiner wahren Bedeutung.* 1852.
- JUSTUS (Dr Briman). — *Der Judenspiegel.* 1883.
- ECKER (Dr). — *Der Judenspiegel im Lichte der Wahrheit.* 1884.
- LEWIN (Ad.). — *Der Judenspiegel des Doctors Justus.* 1884.
- LOEWE (A.-G.). — *Der Shulshan arukh.* 1837.
- Karl MARX. — *Die Judenfrage.* 1844.
- GOLDSCHMIDT (Lazarus). — *Talmud* (German translation).
- JELLINEK (A.). — *Der Judische Stamm.* 1869.
- *Gegen die Antisemiten.* 1882.
- GRAETZ. — *Die Geschichte der Juden.*
- WEININGER (Otto). — *Geschlecht und Charakter.*
- MARR (Wilhelm). — *Der sieg des Judentums über das Christentum.* 1879.
- HERZL (Theodor). — *Der Juden staat.*
- STERN (L.). — *Die Vorschriften der Thora welche Israël in der Zerstreuung zu beobachten hat.* 1904.
- BEGEMANN (W.). — *Vorgeschichte und Anfänge der Freimaurerei in England* 1909.
- GRUBER (Hermann). — *Der giftige Kern.* 1899.
- MAZZINI. — *Freimaurerei und Weltrevolution.*
- OHR (Dr Wilhelm). — *Der Französische Geist und die Freimaurerei.* 1917.
- MUFFELMANN (Ludwig). — *Die Italienische Freimaurerei und ihr wirken für die teilnahme Italiens an den Krieg.* 1915.
- PHAROS (Pr f.). — *Der prozess gegen die Attentäter von Serajevo.* 1918.
- FINDEL (J.-G.). — *Der Jude als Freimaurer.*
- *Grundsätze der Freimaurerei in Völkerleben.*
- ROSENBERG (A.). — *Das Verbrechen der Freimaurerei.* 1920.
- *Der Staats feindliche Zionismus.*
- *Unmoral in Talmud.*
- *Pest in Russland.*
- *Die spur der Juden.* 1919.
- EISELE (Hans). — *Bilder aus dem Kommunistischen Ungarn.* 1920.

- WICHTL (Dr.). — *Weltfreimaurerei, Weltrevolution, Weltrepublik*. 1921.
- EBERLÉ (J.). — *Grossmacht Press*.
- NOSSIG (Alfred). — *Integrales Judentum*.
- KOHN (A.). — *Die Juden und die Freimaurer*.
- FRITSCH (Th.). — *Handbüch der Judenfrage*.
- KLOTH (Emil). — *Sozial Demokratie und Judentum*.
- The Russian socialist Revolutionaries of Berlin. — *Tcheka*.
- NILOSTONSKY. — *Der Bluttausch des Bolschevismus*. 1920.
- POPOFF (Georg). — *Tcheka*. 1926.
- LUDENDORF (E.). — *Die Vernichtung der Freimaurerei*. 1927.
— *Kriegshetze und Volkermorden*. 1928.
- Gregor Schwartz BOSTUNITCH. — *Die Freimaurerei*. 1928.
- HERGETT. — *Aus dem Werkstatt der Freimaurer in oesterreich*. 1928.

INDEX

A

Abel (Father), 35, 36.
 Acacia (l'), 67.
 Adler (Victor), 128.
 Adler (Friedrich), 128.
 Agoston (Pierre), 122.
 Alliance Israélite universelle, 61, 214.
 Alembert (d'), 33.
 Alphonse XIII, 62.
 Alapaievsk, 154.
 Alexandrovitch (grand Duke Michel), 154.
 Alpari, 121.
 Amiable, 39.
 Anderson (John) 22.
 Anthroposophical society, 98, 111.
 Apponyi (comte Albert), 76.
 Aquiba (Rabbi), 157.
 Archives Israélites, 200, 214.
 Arnold (Karl), 125.
 Arpad Bokay (grand master), 68 et seq.
 Asher Ginzberg, 221.
 Askenazim, 195.
 Aulard (prof'), 93.

B

Babeuf, 110.
 Bakunin, 140.
 Balfour (Lord), 129.
 Baruch (B. M.), 205.
 Barruel (abbé), 31.
 Baresay (Adorjan), 72.
 Bar Kocheba, 157.
 Batault (George), 117, 135, 136, 197 et seq. 200 et seq. 233, 245.
 Bazot, 50.
 Beaconsfield (Lord), 128, 166.
 Begemann (W), 22.
 Bela-Kun, 17, 68, 122, et seq. 141, 157.
 Bernstein, 124, 128.
 Berthelot, 76.
 Bertrand de Molleville, 45.

Besant (Mrs), 98, 111, 112.
 Beth-Dine, 209 et seq.
 Birnbaum, 125.
 Bismark, 166.
 Blanc (Louis), 34.
 Blue masonry, 96.
 Blum (Léon), 58, 157.
 Bnai-Brith (universal order of), 98, 215.
 Bnai-Moshe, 216.
 Bnai-Zion, 216.
 Boehme (Jacob), 105.
 Bomberg (Daniel), 199.
 Bonnet, 33.
 Botkin (D'), 153.
 Bostumitch (Gregor-Schwartz), 101.
 Brafman (J.), 207.
 Brauweiler (D'), 62.
 Britan, 149.
 British Museum, 219.
 Bukarin, 149.
 Bulletin de la Grande Loge de France, 57, 112.
 Bund (the), 217.
 Bundesblatt, 61.
 Bureau de correspondance, 42.
 Burke, 179.
 Butmi ,214, 219.

C

Cabet (Étienne), 137.
 Cabrinovic, 78 et seq.
 Cadet (rue), 55.
 Cagliostro, 102.
 Carbonari, 65, 121.
 Carlos (King), 60.
 Carlyle, 179.
 Cartel, 58.
 Carasso (Emmanuel), 67.
 Casimirovic, 81 et seq.
 Castelnau (général de), 56.
 Castros, 61.
 Catharres, 98.
 Cazotte, 102.

Chajes (S. P.), 223.
 Charles, I, 86.
 Charles X, 50.
 Cheka, 149 et seq.
 Chevalier Kadosch, 25.
 Chiossone, 64.
 Chronicle (the jewish), 127.
 Ciganovic, 81 et seq.
 Cochin et Charpentier, 36, 37.
 Cohen, 128.
 Collectivist party, 58.
 Collot d'Herbois, 32.
 Co. masonry, 111.
 Combes, 171.
 Committee of union and progress, 67.
 Communist (the), 128.
 Coolidge (président), 89.
 Constantinovitch (grand Duke), 153.
 Condorcet, 33.
 Congress of Verona, 35.
 Copin-Albancelli, 16, 24, 36, 49, 50, 101 et seq. 145.
 Costas, 61.
 Cox, 127.
 Cremlieux, 214.
 Cretineau-Joly, 17.
 Crowley (Aleister), 98, 112.
 Czar, 153.
 Czarina, 153.
 Czarevitch, 153.
 Czernin (C'), 86.

D

Dearborn independant (the), 211.
 Delassus (Mgr), 30, 31, 36, 49, 50, 54, 62, 92.
 Denikin, 150.
 Denis, 112.
 Deschamps, 49, 50, 103.
 Dezso-Biro, 123.
 Diderot, 33.
 Diener Denes Zoltan, 122.
 Dillon (Dr E. J.), 170.
 Disraëli, 110, 120.
 Djerjensky (Felix), 149.
 Dohna Schlodien (C'), 84 et seq.
 Dostoievsky, 154, 165, 236.
 Dreyfus (affaire), 217.
 Dupin, 50.
 Duport, 45, 47.

E

Eberlé (J.), 171 et seq.
 Eberlin (Elie), 217, 233.

Eckartshausen, 102.
 Eckert, 50.
 Encyclopedists (the), 33, 102.
 Erdelyi, 123.
 Ernst, 125.

F

Feodorovna (grande Duchesse Elisabeth, 153).
 Ferrer, 62 et seq.
 Fereiras, 61.
 Findlay (Sir M.), 129.
 Findel, 16, 103, 105.
 Ford (Henry), 211.
 Fonsecas, 61.
 Forte (Nicolas), 67.
 Forestier (Le), 31.
 Fox film (C'), 10.
 François (A.), 34.
 Francis-Ferdinand (Archduke), 78 et seq.
 Francolin, 93.
 Fraternelle du cinéma, 94.
 Freemason (the), 87.
 Freud, 179.
 Freudism, 181.
 Freund, 124.
 Fulda, 124.
 Furnemont, 60.

G

Gambetta, 53, 166.
 Garbai (Alexander) 122.
 Garibaldi, 65.
 Gemara 199.
 Gestezi (Dr Jules), 72.
 Gnostic catholic church (the), 98.
 Golos Trouda, 130.
 Gombos (Julius), 71.
 Gompers, 133.
 Gordon-Bennet, 175.
 Gougenot des Mousseaux, 101 et seq.
 Grabez, 78 et seq.
 Grainha (prof' George), 61.
 Grandes Duchesses (Russian), 153.
 Grand Orient de France, 23, 25, 33, 40, 63, 66, 93, 97, 110 et seq.
 Grand Orient de Belgique, 60.
 " " of Italy, 67.
 Grand Orient Ottoman, 67.
 Grande Loge de France, 97.
 Grand Lodge of England, 22, 23.
 " " of Buda-Pest, 75.
 " " of Germany, 85.
 Groos (René), 228.

Guepeou, 152.
Gustavus III, 35, 36.

H

Haase, 124, 128, 227.
Harrach (Count.), 78.
Hassidim, 195.
Haugwitz (C^t von), 35.
Haute Vente Romaine, 17, 26, 121.
Heine (Henri) 157.
Heimann, 124.
Helvetius, 33.
Herriot, 56 et seq.
Herzl, 221.
Hertzfeld, 124.
Hervé (Gustave), 59.
Herzen (Alexander), 65.
High commissaries of the people
(Russian), 131.
Hirsch (Baron Maurice), 214.
Hirsch (news agency), 175.
Hirsch, 124.
Holbach (d'), 33.
Hughan (W. J.), 22.
Humanité (l'), 59, 158.
Hungary, 26, 244.
Hungarian bolshevism, 122 et seq.

I

Ibn-Kaldum, 192.
Illic, 180 et seq.
Illuminati 16, 26, 30, 34, 35, 98.
International Jew, 211.

J

Jacobins, 102.
Jaszi, 122, 141.
Jew (the international), 211.
Jewish chronicle (the), 127.
Jewish committee (American), 212.
Jewish world (the) 105, 127.
Jouin (Mgr), 47, 72 et seq., 77, 103,
106, 130, 200, 267 et seq.
Judah Iscariote, 144.
Judah the holy, 199.
Jumel, 30.

K

Kabbala (the jewish), 91, 105, 200.
Kadmi Cohen, 135, 158, 180 et seq.
Kahal (the), 207 et seq.
Karo (rabbi Joseph), 200.
Karolyi, 69, 75, 141.

Kautsky, 124.
Kelet (the), 75.
Kerensky, 141.
Kohler, 79.
Kohn, 100, 124.
Kossuth, 65.
Kothner, 85.
Komnin (ev.), 151.
Kranold, 125.
Krishnamurti, 111.
Kunfi, 124, 141.
Kunzi, 122.
Kurt Eisner, 124, 125, 141, 157, 227.

L

Lafayette, 33.
Lambelin (Roger), 220.
Lantoine (Albert), 56, 112.
Lane (William), 137.
Landauer, 227.
Landeberg, 124.
Lanze, 16.
Lasalle, 128, 157.
Latsis, 148.
Latomia (the), 70, 112.
Lawton (Lancelot), 168.
Lazare (Bernard), 101 et seq., 120,
135, 183 et seq. 988, 200 et seq.,
218, 221 et seq.
Lebey (André), 88.
Lecouteux de Canteleu (C^{te}), 91.
Lemann (abbé), 48, 120.
Lemmi (Adriano), 65.
Lenin, 140, 169.
Leo XIII (Pape), 18.
Leusse (c^{te} de), 56.
Levine, 227.
Levy (Oscar), 118, 226.
Levy Bing, 214.
Lewis (A. D.), 187.
Liebknecht, 124.
Lieven (Max), 141.
Ligue des droits de l'homme, 94.
Ligue de l'enseignement, 94.
Lipsinsky, 124.
Lodge les amis réunis, 46.
• les chevaliers bienfaisants, 35.
• Labor et lux, 67.
• Martinovics, 74.
• Macedonia, 67.
• des neufs sœurs, 40.
• Perseveranza, 67.
• Philippos, 67.
• Solidarity, 64.
• Veritas, 67.
• Trinosophes, 50.
• Zu den drei (Weltkugeln), 61.
Lokotj, 140

Lowenberg (Max), 125.
 Louis XVI, 35, 36.
 Louis XVIII, 50.
 Ludendorff (général), 84.
 Lukazs, 122.
 Lunatcharsky, 144.
 Lusk (Senator), 124.
 Luxemburg (Rosa), 124, 227.

M

Macdonald, 156.
 Magalhaes Lima 60, 87.
 Magnes (rabbi J. L.), 128.
 Mahmoud orphi Pasha, 67.
 Malouet (Baron), 167.
 Malynski (E.), 52.
 Manuel (King), 60.
 Marr (Wilhelm), 236.
 Marmontel, 45.
 Martenez de Pasqualès, 102.
 Marcellot, 56.
 Marx (Karl), 123, 128, 157, 158, 226, 227.
 Martin (G.), 37 et seq.
 Matin (le), 55.
 Maura, 64.
 Maxé (Jean), 221.
 Maximalists (the), 157.
 Mazzini, 64 et seq.
 Melgounov (S. P.), 148 et seq.
 Mennevée (R.), 56.
 Mentor, 127.
 Mercier (cardinal), 171.
 Metro Goldwyn (Cy), 180.
 Michel (A. G.), 56.
 Michel (Henri), 30.
 Mikailovitch (Grand Duke Michel), 153.
 Mishna, 199.
 Mitnagdim, 195.
 Montefiore (baron), 172.
 Monzie (A. de), 189.
 Montagu, 128.
 Move (the), 72.
 Morayta, 62.
 Mun (M. de), 54.
 Mullendorf (Grand Master), 85.
 Mussolini, 176, 244.

N

Nameless Beast, 110, 112, 114.
 Nameless order (the), 99.
 Napoléon I, 49, 209.
 Napoléon III, 51.
 Narodna odbrana, 81 et seq.
 Nathan, 100.
 Neue Freie presse (die), 36.

Netchvolodoff, général, 214.
 New York Herald (the), 175.
 New York Times (the), 133.
 Nietzsche, 119.
 Nilus (Serge), 219.
 Nordau (Max), 172.
 Nossig (Alfred), 135, 158, 221, 223, 233.
 Nouveau Mercure, 229.
 Nubius, 104.

O

Orient of Nantes, 30.
 Ordo Templi orientis, 98, 112.
 Orléans (duc d'), 46.
 Ouritzky, 152.

P

Paine (Thomas), 110.
 Paley (Vladimir), 153.
 Palatinus (Joseph), 72.
 Patriot (the), 110 et seq., 168, 175.
 Peter Agoston, 122.
 Pereiros, 61.
 Perm, 154.
 Pharos (prof') 79 et seq.
 Piccolo-Tigre, 104.
 Pitt-Rivers (George), 134 et seq., 226.
 Pike (Albert), 105.
 Poale Zion (the), 216 et seq.
 Portugal, 60 et seq.
 Potiorek (gen.), 78.
 Pogany (Joseph), 122, 124, 141.
 Preuss, 124.
 Preuss (Arthur), 104, 112.
 Premusic, 82.
 Princip, 78 et seq.
 Protocols (the), 219 et seq.

R

Race (Jewish), 137.
 Radical-socialist party, 58.
 Rathenau (Walter), 169.
 Raynor (Sir William), 105.
 Reading (lord), 128.
 Reis, 125.
 Regnault de St Jean d'Angély, 18.
 Religion (Jewish), 197.
 Reuss (Theodor), 98.
 Reus (Raphaël), 160.
 Revue universelle (la), 149.
 Revue internationale des Sociétés secrètes (la), 77, 208.
 Reveillon, 46.
 Ricardo (David), 164.

Ricci (Raphaelo), 67.
 Rite of Memphis and Misraim, 98.
 Rivista della Massoneria, 65.
 Robison (prof^r John), 16, 108.
 Robespierre, 178.
 Rochefort, 175.
 Ronai, 122.
 Rohrberg (commission), 149.
 Rosanbo (marquis de), 29.
 Rosenfeld, 124.
 Rosenfeld (Dr Kurt), 125.
 Rosenberg (Arthur), 106, 139, 205.
 Rosenhek, 125.
 Rosicrucians of California, 98.
 Rose-Croix, 25.
 Rotschild 195.
 Rotschild (James de), 165.
 Roul (The), 151.
 Rouse (Chas. H.), 112.

S

Sanhedrim, 209.
 Sarda y Salvany (don) 19.
 Salli (Aurelio), 65.
 Sarolea (prof^r), 150.
 Sartinnes (M^r de), 167.
 Say Léon, 209.
 Scottish Rite (the), 25, 68.
 Schiffer, 124.
 Schwartz, 124.
 Sepher Ha Zohar (the), 200.
 Sephardim, 195.
 Serajevo, 77 et seq.
 S. F. I. O. party, 58.
 Shulchan Arukh (the), 200.
 Sombart (Werner), 163 et seq., 200, 225.
 Sokoloff (Nicolas), 154.
 Souhami (Jacques), 67.
 Socialism, 157.
 Spartacism, 122.
 Spain, 61.
 Spiritists, 112.
 Star in the East (order of), 111.
 Stendhal, 50.
 St-Martin, 102, 105.
 St-Germain (Comte de), 102.
 St-Johns Masonry, 96.
 Steiner Rudolph, 98.
 Stella Matutina (order of the), 111.
 Sunday Express (the), 112.
 Sursock (George), 67.
 Sverdloff, 153.
 Swedenborg, 105.
 Swinton (John), 172.
 Syndicat des Instituteurs, 94.
 Szalay (Charles), 74.

Szamuely (Tibor), 122, 124.
 Szende (Paul), 74.

T

Taft (président), 215.
 Talmud (the), 199.
 Talheimer, 124.
 Tankosic, 82.
 Tehaka (the) 149 et seq.
 Teleki (Comte Paul), 71.
 Texeiras, 61.
 Tharaud (J. and. J.), 123, 144.
 Theosophy (the), 98, 111, 162.
 Theriot, 32.
 Thurston (rev. H.-J.), 108 et seq.
 Tiriforque, 52.
 Tora (the), 197.
 Tormay (C. de), 122, 143.
 Torrigiani (grand master), 71.
 Tourmentin (abbé), 55.
 Trocasse (F.), 176.
 Trotsky, 123, 128, 129, 141, 144, 157, 195.
 Turks (Young), 66.

U

Union des combattants républicains, 94.
 Univers Israélite (L'), 200.

V

Valentinoff (A.), 145.
 Varga (Bela), 123, 124.
 Vasconcellos (Marquis de), 142.
 Vater, 88.
 Versailles (peace conference), 170.
 Victoire (La), 59.
 Vilag (the), 74.
 Vince, 123.
 Virieu (Comte de), 35.
 Viviani, 53.
 Voltaire, 32, 33.
 Vorcell (Stanislas), 65.

W

Ward (prof. lester F.), 172.
 Webster (M^{rs}), 31, 91, 101 et seq., 107, 137, 138 143, 158, 175, 178, 180, 220.
 Weishaupt, 17, 30, 34, 98, 102.
 Weizmann (Chaim)
 Weltkampf (der), 106, 139, 140.
 White book (the english), 129.
 White lodge (the great), 111.
 Wilson (président), 86.

William II, 86.
Wichtl, 60, 64, 87, 101, 103, 106.
Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung, 69 et
seq.
Wise (Dr Isaac M.), 101, 105.
Wollheim Caspar, 125.
Wolf (News Agency), 175.
Wolski (Kalixt de), 208.
World (the Jewish), 105, 127.

Y

Yourovsky, 153.

Z

Zangwill (Israël), 128.
Zevaes (Alexandre), 30.
Zinovieff, 149.
Zionism, 244 et seq.



VICOMTE LEON DE PONCINS is descended from an old and distinguished French family, having a long tradition in the study of spiritual and political subversion. His paternal great grand-father was killed fighting against the 1789 Revolution, and his maternal great grand-father was imprisoned by Napoleon for his support of the monarchy.

The author himself, while refraining from all direct contact with political activity, has written nearly twenty books dealing with specific aspects of the problem of subversion in the modern world, and outside France, his works have been published in England, Germany, Italy, Spain, Brazil, Hungary, Bulgaria and Portugal. Before the last war, he founded and directed the famous review *Contre-Révolution*, which was published from Geneva in Switzerland.

During the Second World War he was enlisted in French Military Intelligence in which he served until the Liberation. Later the Liberation Authorities brought an unsuccessful prosecution against him for alleged treason in respect of some of his writings but it was found that he had merely published texts by eminent Jewish scholars, the authenticity of which were incontestable.

Of all who have attacked the problem of political and spiritual subversion in the modern world, none has won more universal acclaim by his penetrating logic and strict impartiality than Vicomte de Poncins.

DE PONCINS

JUDAISM AND THE VATICAN

CBC

JUDAISM AND THE VATICAN



VICOMTE LEON DE PONCINS

© VICOMTE LÉON DE PONCINS 1967

Reprinted 1985

Reprinted 1999

JUDAISM *and the* VATICAN

AN ATTEMPT AT
SPIRITUAL SUBVERSION

Translated from the
French of
VICOMTE LÉON DE PONCINS
by
Timothy Tindal-Robertson

Christian Book Club of America
Post Office Box 900566
Palmdale, California 93590-0566

"It is a vital principle never to deform the truth. Truth is always fundamental for all responsible men. It should always prevail."

Pope John XXIII

"It is a veritable competition as to who can make the Jews appear most hateful. Richly chequered and pathetic as is the narrator of the fourth Gospel (St. John), the palm goes to Matthew; his unerring hand unleashed the poisoned arrow that can never be withdrawn."

Jules Isaac: *Jésus et Israël*, p. 483

"Professor Isaac, a distinguished French-Jewish historian . . . devoted the last years of his life to a study of the religious roots of anti-Semitism. He had audiences with the late Popes Pius XII and John XXIII, the latter being of considerable importance and leading to subsequent emendation of certain passages offensive to Jews in the Roman liturgy."

Jewish Chronicle 29th October 1965, p. 14

"... the permanent and latent source of anti-Semitism is none other than Christian religious teaching of every description, and the traditional, tendentious interpretations of the Scriptures."

Jules Isaac: *Jésus et Israël*, p. 572

CONTENTS

PART I

THE "TEACHING OF CONTEMPT"

Chapter	page
1 The Jewish Question and the Council	9
2 Jules Isaac and the Evangelists	14
3 Jules Isaac and the Church Fathers	20

PART II

THE PROBLEM OF THE AGES

4 The Complexity of the Jewish Problem	45
5 Mosaic Law and the Talmud	53
6 The Marranos	60
7 Assimilation	64
8 A State within a State	73
9 Anti-Semitism	82
10 World Revolution	96
11 Eternal Antagonism	111
12 "Portrait of a Jew"	123

PART III

THE COUNCIL'S SOLUTION

13 The Vatican Vote	133
14 Tracts against the Council	159
15 How the Jews changed Catholic Thinking	167
Appendix I Appeal to Heads of State	175
Appendix II Six Million Innocent Victims	178
Bibliography	191
Index	193

DEDICATED

*To the Memory of the Church Fathers who
constructed Christian civilisation.*

PART I

THE "TEACHING OF CONTEMPT"

"The Ecumenical Council's Declaration on the Church and non-Christians lifting the charge of collective guilt from the Jewish people was impudent, cheap politics, and an insult to God," said Dr. Eliezer Berkovitz, Professor of Jewish Philosophy at the Jewish University of America, in Toronto last week.

"He said that Christianity was spread throughout Europe not by the Gospel but by the sword, and the spirit of ecumenism and interfaith understanding now put forward was little more than a public relations stunt."

Jewish Chronicle, 28th January, 1966, p. 17

"The Gospel version of the Jesus trial, as presented to us by the scribes of the Bishop of Rome as the great judicial event of the first century, is terrifying in its cunning malevolence."

D. G. Runes: *The Jew and the Cross*, 1965, p. 26

"The difficult and slow process of building a happier relationship between Christian and Jew can only proceed if stereotypes and prejudices are cast aside and replaced by rational and intelligent reappraisal. It is essential that we understand more about each other. We must talk, but conversation does not mean conversion."

Jewish Chronicle editorial, 27th January, 1967

I

THE JEWISH QUESTION AND THE COUNCIL

ON the 19th November 1964, the bishops and cardinals of the Catholic Church gathered in Council at Rome passed by an overwhelming majority the Schema dealing with the attitude of the Church towards Judaism.

Le Monde of the 27th November referred to the violent reactions provoked by this vote among the Eastern Rite Catholic churches and among the Arab states.

The article concluded with a post-script from the paper's Rome correspondent, H. Fesquet, who was considered the spokesman for Father Congar, the leader of the Catholic progressive wing. Fesquet began by recalling that conciliar votes are secret, and then went on to add:

"Ninety-nine Fathers voted 'No'. One thousand six hundred and fifty-one voted 'Yes' and two hundred and forty-two voted 'Yes' with reservations. Moreover, this was only a provisional vote, and the final ballot will take place at the end of the fourth session of the Council in 1965.

"In the general assembly the Eastern bishops intervened as a body, saying that they were opposed in principle to a declaration on the Jews by the Council. We can therefore conjecture that the ninety-nine Fathers who had voted in the negative were in the main the Eastern ones."

The following is a passage taken from the text of the declaration on the Jews voted by the Council Fathers on the 20th November 1964:

"... Since such is the inheritance accepted by Christians from the Jews, this holy Council resolves expressly to further and to recommend reciprocal understanding and appreciation, to be obtained by theological study and fraternal discussion and, beyond that, inasmuch as it severely disapproves of any wrong inflicted upon men wheresoever, it equally deplores and condemns hatred and maltreatment (vexationem) of Jews. . . .

"Everyone should be careful, therefore, not to expose the Jewish people as a rejected nation, be it in catechetical tuition, in preaching of God's Word or in worldly conversation, nor should anything be said or done which may alienate the minds of men from the Jews. Equally, all should be on their guard not to impute to the Jews of our time that which was perpetrated in the Passion of Christ."

(*The Tablet*, 26th September 1964, p. 1094—the revised text on the agenda for the third session)

At first sight, this motion seems to conform to the unchanging doctrine of the Church which, while striving to protect the Christian community against Jewish influences, has always condemned persecution, a fact which has indeed been candidly acknowledged by a Jewish writer, Max I. Dimont:

"Popes and princes of the Middle Ages could have wiped out the Jews completely had they wanted to, but they did not want to. . . . When, because of social, economic, or even religious pressures, the presence of the Jews became unwanted, they were banished, not killed. The Church endowed all human beings with a soul, and it took a man's life only to save his soul. It was only when religion lost its deterrent hold on man that Western society could entertain the idea of coolly murdering millions because it felt there was no room for them."

(M. I. Dimont: *Jews, God and History*, p. 286)

In fact, however, the motion voted on in Rome implies that the majority of the Council Fathers are under a serious misapprehension as to what constitutes the very essence of Judaism. It would seem that they have only applied themselves to the humanitarian aspect of the problem skilfully submitted by the spokesmen of World Jewry and by a Press largely favourable to Jewish interests.

The truth, it is suggested, is that a number of Jewish organisations and personalities are behind the reforms which were proposed at the Council with a view to modifying the Church's attitude and time-honoured teaching about Judaism: Jules Isaac, Label Katz, President of the B'nai B'rith, Nahum Goldman, President of the World Jewish Congress, etc.

These reforms are very important because they suggest that for two thousand years the Church had been mistaken and that she must make amends and completely reconsider her attitude to the Jews.

Among the Catholic laity, a similar campaign is being carried on by progressive prelates who, taking their stand on the historical fact

that Christianity is in direct line of descent from Judaism, claim a toleration for Jews, which the latter as we shall see, are far from professing with regard to Christians. In actual fact, for both parties, it is a weapon designed to overthrow traditional Catholicism, which they consider the chief enemy.

Of the Jewish personalities mentioned above, there was one who played a vital role: the writer, Jules Isaac, of Aix-en-Provence, who died recently. He was at one time Inspector-General of Public Education in France and the author of academic books on history.

Isaac turned the Council to advantage, having found there considerable support among progressive bishops. In fact he became the principal theorist and promoter of the campaign being waged against the traditional teaching of the Church.

This is the gist of his thesis:

We must have done with anti-Semitism, the logical outcome of which was the liquidation of European Jews at Auschwitz and other death camps during the Second World War.

According to him, the most dangerous form of anti-Semitism is Christian anti-Semitism, which is fundamentally theological. Indeed, the Christian attitude to Judaism has always been based on the account of the Passion as described by the four Evangelists and as commented on by the Fathers of the Church such as St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Pope Gregory the Great, St. Agobard, Primate of the Gauls, and many others.

Thus it is this theological foundation that Jules Isaac sought to undermine in disputing the historical value of the Gospel accounts and in discrediting the arguments advanced by the Fathers of the Church to protect Christians from being influenced by the Jews who were charged with everlasting plotting against the Christian order.

Now let us consider in detail what steps Jules Isaac took, both in the Vatican and in the heart of the Council, to get his views accepted.

After the disappearance of his wife and daughter, who died during deportation, he dedicated the last twenty years of his life to a critical study of relations between Judaism and Christianity, and to this end he wrote two important books, *Jésus et Israël*, first published in 1946 and republished in 1959, and *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, first published in 1948 and republished in 1956.

In these books Jules Isaac fiercely censures Christian teaching, which he says has been the source of modern anti-Semitism, and preaches, though it would be more correct to say he demands, the "purification" and "amendment" of doctrines two thousand years old. Further on we shall briefly examine these two books; for the

moment let us continue our review of the part played by Jules Isaac in bringing the Jewish question to the attention of the Council.

As early as the end of the war he began organising both national and international gatherings attended by sympathetic Catholics who were favourably disposed towards his arguments.

In 1947,¹ following Judaeo-Catholic dialogues of this kind, which were attended, among the Jews, by Edmond Fleg and Samy Lattés, and among the Catholics, by Henri Marrou, Father Daniélou, and the Abbé Vieillard of the Episcopal Secretariat, he drew up an 18 point memorandum on "The rectification of Christian teaching concerning Israel".

The same year he was invited to the international conference in Seelisberg in Switzerland attended by seventy members from nineteen countries, among whom were Father Callixte Lopinot, Father Demann, Pastor Freudenberg and the Grand Rabbi Kaplan. In general session the conference adopted the "Ten Points of Seelisberg", which suggested to the Christian Churches measures to be adopted to purify religious teaching concerning the Jews.

Then Jules Isaac established the first Judaeo-Christian friendship society with the help of the Grand Rabbi of France and his assistant, Jacob Kaplan, and the Jews Edmond Fleg and Leon Algazi, Catholic friends such as Henri Marrou, Jacques Madaule, Jacques Nantet, and Protestant friends such as Professor Lovsky and Jacques Martin. The society's regulations debarred members from trying to convert one another, and its establishment was soon followed by others in Aix, Marseilles, Nîmes, Montpellier, Lyons and lastly in Lille, where Jules Isaac secured the help of a nun of Dom Bosco's order and the support of Cardinal Liénart. Later on he founded another in North Africa.

In 1949 he made contacts with the clergy in Rome, and through them he was able to obtain a private audience with Pius XII, to whom he pleaded on behalf of Judaism, asking him to have the "Ten Points of Seelisberg" examined.

In 1959 he held a conference at the Sorbonne on the need for revising Christian teaching on the Jews and he closed with an appeal to Pope John's sense of justice and love of truth.

Shortly afterwards he met several prelates of the Roman Curia, in particular Cardinals Tisserand, Jullie, Ottaviani, and Cardinal Bea; and on the 13th June 1960 he was granted an audience by the Pope, whom he asked to condemn the "teaching of contempt", suggesting

¹ All the following information is taken from statements made by Jules Isaac himself.

that a sub-commission should be set up specifically to study the problem.

Some time afterwards Jules Isaac "learned with joy that his suggestions had been considered by the Pope and handed on to Cardinal Bea for examination". The latter set up a special working party to study relations between the Church and Israel, which finally resulted in the Council vote on the 20th November 1964.

JULES ISAAC AND THE EVANGELISTS

LET us now examine the objections to the Gospel writers raised by Jules Isaac, in particular with reference to their account of the Passion, and his objection to the Church Fathers whom he holds responsible for what he calls the "teaching of contempt" with which apparently the whole Christian mentality has been completely impregnated.

Jules Isaac frigidly denies that the account given by the Evangelists has any historical value:

"The historian has the right and the duty, an absolute duty, to regard the Gospel accounts as witnesses for the prosecution (against the Jews), with the aggravating drawback that they are the sole witnesses and that all four of them write from the same angle: we have no Jewish or pagan evidence for comparison or with which to weigh one against the other. Now this bias of the Gospel writers is nowhere more evident or more marked, this absence of non-Christian documentation is nowhere more deplorable, than in the story of the Passion. . . . But it is quite striking how all four writers are preoccupied with reducing Roman responsibility to the minimum in order correspondingly to increase that of the Jews. Moreover, they are not equally biased: in this respect Matthew is far and away the worst, not only worse than Mark or Luke but perhaps even worse than John. Is this so surprising? There are no more bitter opponents than brothers in enmity: now Matthew was a Jew, fundamentally a Jew, the most Jewish of the Evangelists, and according to an apparently well-founded tradition he wrote 'in Palestine and for the Palestinians' to prove from the Old Testament that Jesus was indeed the Messiah prophesied by the Scriptures. . . . But does the cause of historical truth derive any value from this? We are at liberty to doubt it. It is not at all surprising that of the three Synoptic writers Matthew is the most biased, his account of the Passion

being the most tendentious, while the most impartial in the circumstances—or the least biased—is Luke, the only non-Jewish Gospel writer, the only one of Gentile origin.

(Jules Isaac: *Jésus et Israël*, pp. 428-9)

"But let us not forget . . . that they are all in agreement in asserting that there, in Pilate's presence, at a unique moment in time, at an hour which struck once for all mankind and which means more to humanity than any other moment in the whole world, the whole Jewish people expressly and explicitly took on itself the responsibility of the innocent Blood, the total responsibility, the national responsibility. It remains to be shown to what degree the texts and the reality of which they give an indication warrant the appalling gravity of such an assertion.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 478)

"The Christian charge brought against Israel, that of deicide, an accusation of murder which is in itself murderous, is the most serious, the most injurious possible; it is also the most iniquitous.

"Jesus had been condemned to the agony of the Cross, a Roman punishment, by Pontius Pilate, the Roman Procurator.

"But the four evangelists, for once in agreement, state that Jesus was given up to the Romans by the Jews, and that, owing to irresistible pressure by the Jews, Pilate, although he wished to declare Jesus innocent, nevertheless had him put to death. Therefore, it is upon the Jews, not upon the Romans who were mere instruments, that responsibility for the Crime devolves, and it weighs them down with supernatural force and crushes them.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 567)

"At first sight we are impressed by the unanimity—at least on the surface—of the four evangelists on the point at issue, namely Jewish responsibility.

"That the Roman pronounced the death sentence under pressure from the Jews all four Gospel writers to be sure earnestly bear witness with one voice. But as their testimony is an indictment which is prejudiced and impassioned, circumstantial and belated, frankly speaking, we find it impossible to accept it without reservation.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 478)

"Matthew is the only one who recognised (xxvii. 24-25) that the Procurator Pilate ceremoniously washed his hands according to Jewish custom to rid himself of the guilt of innocent blood

which he was compelled to shed. He is the only one to observe that 'all the people' cried out, 'His blood be upon us and upon our children'. Mark, Luke and John know nothing and say nothing, either about the famous ablution or about the terrifying exclamation.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 481)

"The suggestive gradation observed in the first phase of the trial is repeated again here, and it is highly perceptible from Mark to Matthew, according to whom (xxvii. 24-25), Pilate deliberately absolves himself from responsibility (through washing his hands), which 'the Jewish people', by contrast, takes almost joyfully on itself. In Luke's account Pilate three times declares Jesus innocent and obviously wishes to set him free (xxii. 14, 15, 16, 20, 22). John goes even further: he does not hesitate to prolong the extraordinary comings and goings of the Procurator in and out of the praetorium; after the interlude of the scourging comes the pitiable exhibition: 'Behold the man!'; then more conversation between Pilate and 'the Jews'; the agitation of Pilate when he learns that Jesus has claimed to be the 'Son of God'; then Pilate and Jesus exchange words; a further effort by Pilate to release Jesus; then blackmail by the Jews 'if you set him free, you are no friend of Caesar's' (John xix. 12), to which the vacillating Procurator at length gives way: 'then he delivered him up to them to be crucified'.

(John xix. 16)

"A veritable competition as to who can makes the Jews more hateful.

"What could not be said, what has not been said on the grounds of historical probability. But it is dangerous ground, as I well know: truth 'can sometimes appear improbable'. It makes me all the more inclined to remark that, conspicuously in Matthew and John, the figure of Pontius Pilate exceeds the bounds of improbability. . . .

"It is hard to believe that the all-powerful Procurator in bewilderment had to consult the Jews, his subjects, and the high priests, his instruments, as to what he should do with the prisoner, Jesus.

(Mark xv. 12; Matthew xxvii. 22)

"It is hard to believe that the butcher of Jews and Samaritans, suddenly overcome by scruples about a Galilean Jew accused of messianic agitation, stooped to solicit the pity of the Jews for him: 'What evil has he done?'

(Mark xv. 14; Matthew xxvii. 23)

"It is hard to believe that a Roman official had to have recourse to the Jewish symbolic ritual of washing hands to rid himself of his responsibility—in the eyes of the God of Israel no doubt.

(Matthew xxvii. 24)

"It is hard to believe that the cunning politician in him took it into his head that day to take the side of the luckless prophet against the native oligarchy upon whom it was customary for the Roman rulers to rely and upon whom he himself depended, for Pilate held Judea through Hanan and Caiaphas.

"It is hard to believe that the representative of Rome, whose supreme duty and care was to ensure respect for Roman grandeur, went to and fro in honour of a few devout Jews from the judge's seat to the street outside where they were gathered.

"It is hard to believe that a strong ruler, though ready to shed blood to prevent any rising or threat of a rising, nevertheless to please the Jewish crowd agreed to release a 'well-known' rioter imprisoned on a charge of sedition and murder (and why did the crucifixion of Jesus have to follow the release of Barabbas?).

"It is hard to believe that the judge, the law-maker of the province, though apparently oblivious of the fact, said to the high priests his interlocutors: 'Take him yourselves and crucify him.'

(John xix. 6)

"It is hard to believe that a pagan sceptic was impressed by the charge cast against Jesus by the Jews—according to John xix. 7-8—that 'he had made himself out to be the Son of God' (in the Christian sense, being quite incomprehensible at first sight either to a pagan or to a Jew).

"It is hard to believe that a Roman lawyer, so precise in mind, could have apparently waived all traditional methods of procedure during the trial of Jesus.

"But it is even more unbelievable, a thousand times more so, that a Jewish crowd, 'the whole people' of the Jews, patriotic and devout, suddenly became enraged against Jesus to the point of besieging Pilate, a detested Roman, and demanding that the prophet who had been so eagerly sought after the day before, a man of the people, one of their own people, should be crucified in the Roman way by Roman soldiers. . . .

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, pp. 483-4)

"And what of the historic scene which emphasised the contrast between the action of Pilate washing his hands and the cry of 'the whole people' of the Jews: 'His blood be upon us and upon our children'?

"We have already referred to it, but not nearly enough when one considers all the evils to which it has given rise.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 489)

"I still maintain that Pilate's gesture was 'completely at variance with the procedure of Roman trials'; that is sufficient. I have the right to draw the conclusion that in all probability the gesture never was in fact made. The whole performance is of doubtful authenticity and we find that it is in fact pushed to absurd lengths.

"The reply of the Jews 'His blood be upon us and upon our children' undoubtedly becomes less paradoxical when it is linked with ancient Hebraic traditions and expressions. But, as we have said, it is quite as incredible by reason of its heinous character and of the rage to which it claims to give utterance. . . .

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, pp. 491-2)

"Never has a narrative appeared so obviously tendentious, or anxiety to 'impress' been so marked, culminating in verses 24 and 25, which compel conviction in all open minds.

"No, Pilate did not wash his hands according to the Jewish custom.

"No, Pilate did not protest his innocence.

"No, the Jewish crowd did not cry out: 'His blood be upon us and upon our children. . . .'

"But what is the good of stressing all this any more? The case is up for hearing in the eyes of all men of good faith. And I venture to say, in the eyes of God too.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 493)

"Therefore the total responsibility of the Jewish people, of the Jewish nation and of Israel for condemning Jesus to death is a matter of legendary belief and not based on solid historical foundations. . . .

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, pp. 514-15)

"To maintain the opposite viewpoint, one would have to be intractably and fanatically prejudiced, or have a blind belief in a tradition which, as we know, is not 'normal', and thus ought not to be laid down as a rule of thought for even the most docile sons of the Church—a tradition which, moreover, is infinitely noxious and murderous, and which, as I have said and shall repeat, leads to Auschwitz—Auschwitz and other places. Some six million Jews were liquidated solely because they were Jews and this

brought shame not only upon the German people but upon the whole of Christianity, because without centuries of Christian teaching, preaching and vituperation, Hitler's teaching, propaganda and vituperation would have been impossible."

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 508)

In short, in their account of the Passion, now revised and corrected by Jules Isaac, the writers of the Gospels appear as arrant liars of whom Matthew is unquestionably the most venomous.

"He bears the palm. His unerring hand unleashed the poisoned arrow that can never be withdrawn."

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 483)

JULES ISAAC AND THE CHURCH FATHERS

AS we have seen, the Evangelists have been disposed of, and Jules Isaac now proceeds to attack the Church Fathers, who for 1,500 years have codified Christian doctrine on Judaism.

"It is only too true that there was a strong current of anti-Semitism in the pagan world, long prior to Christian anti-Semitism.

"It is only too true that this anti-Semitism sometimes produced bloody conflicts and pogroms.

"It is only too true that its principal cause was the exclusiveness and separatism of Israel, which was essentially religious, dictated by Yahve and the Scriptures, and without which Christianity evidently could not have been conceived, since it is due to this Jewish separatism that faith in Yahve and the knowledge and cult of the one God was preserved intact from all defilement and transmitted from generation to generation until the coming of the Christ.

"But what do these facts justify?

"Just because there was a pagan anti-Semitism, which indeed took its origin from the divine commandment, what ground is this for Christianity in copying it (having fallen victim to it itself for a time), and further, for having developed it to a paroxysm of virulence, evil-mindedness, and slanderous and murderous hatred?

(Jules Isaac: *Jésus et Israël*, p. 353)

"Thus there began to develop in the Christian conscience (if I may venture to say so), the theme of the Crime, of the Unworthiness, of the Curse, of the Chastisement of Israel, a chastisement which was, like the Crime itself, collective, without appeal, embodying for ever 'carnal Israel', Israel fallen, outcast, Israel-Judas, Israel-Cain. This theme is closely interwoven but not to be confused with another, which became a doctrinal thesis, that of the Witness-People--chosen by God, the Jew Saint Paul

had said, for the fullness of final conversion, unhappy witness 'to its own iniquities and to our truth', said St. Augustine 350 years later, bearing from God, as did Cain, a sign which is at once its protection and draws on it the execration of the Christian world."

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 359)

"No weapon has proved more successful against Judaism and her faithful than the teaching of contempt, forged principally by the Church Fathers in the fourth century, and within it, no thesis has been more harmful than that of the 'deicide people'. Christian mentality has become impregnated with these ideas to the very roots of its subconsciousness. Failure to recognise this fact is to ignore or disguise the major source of Christian anti-Semitism, and the spring which has nourished popular opinion. But the latter did not produce it, for the teaching of contempt is a theological creation."

(Jules Isaac: *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, p. 327)

"'Deicide.' When did the defamatory epithet appear, later to be turned, oh happy discovery, to murderous use, to become an indelible brand, goading to fury and crime (homicide, genocide)? It is impossible to name an exact date. But one can discern among the confused flood of Judaeo-Christian polemics the main current from which it stemmed.

(Jules Isaac: *Jésus et Israël*, p. 360)

"In the fourth century a step forward was taken. The destinies of the Church and the Empire having united, all caution was put aside, and the tone of anti-Jewish controversy could be increased, as indeed it was. It became openly abusive. . . .

"The Christian anti-Semitism which then began to develop was essentially theological, but it could also be called 'ecclesiastical' or 'clerical'. Its foundation was the accusation of deicide.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 361)

"Murderer of Jesus, the Christ-Messiah, murderer of the Man-God,

deicide!--

"Such is the accusation cast against the whole Jewish people . . . a capital accusation linked to the theme of capital chastisement . . . in such a way that by an ingenious alternating mechanism of doctrinal sentences and popular outbursts there is ascribed to God what, seen from the earthly sphere, is assuredly the work

of incurable human vileness, this perversity, variously and cleverly exploited from century to century, from generation to generation, to culminate in Auschwitz, and the gas chambers and crematorium ovens of Nazi Germany."

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, pp. 351-2)

"One must recognise the sad fact that nearly all the Church Fathers have contributed their stone in this work of moral lapidation (not without material repercussions): St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Jerome, St. Ephrem, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Ambrose and St. Epiphany—who was born a Jew—St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and many others. But two of this illustrious cohort, venerable in so many other respects, deserve a special mention: the great Greek orator, St. John Chrysostom (i.e. St. John of the Golden Mouth), who is distinguished by his abundant and truculent invective, and his excessive insults; and the great doctor of Christian latinity, St. Augustine, for the wonderful (and dangerous) ingenuity he displayed in elaborating a coherent doctrine."

(Jules Isaac: *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, p. 161)

We will now pass from this general review of the Church Fathers to examine particular instances, quoting passages from the study Jules Isaac has devoted to the great Doctors of the Church.

In 386 St. John Chrysostom began to preach at Antioch, where there was an important Jewish community. He began with eight homilies against the Jews in a tone which "is often of unparalleled violence".

"All the grievances and insults are to be found in Chrysostom. He displays better than any other, and often with unequalled violence and even coarseness, on occasions, the fusion of elements taken from popular anti-Semitism and from specifically theological grounds for complaint, and the use of biblical texts, which are the hall-mark of the Christian anti-Semite.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 256)

"Let it be plainly said: whatever his intention, this inordinate piece of outrage and calumny is a revolting thing on the part of a sacred orator.

"Seeds of scorn and hatred such as these inevitably produce their harvest. You reap as you sow. Silhouetted down the ages to come beyond the holy declaimers of the fourth century, devoutly dragging their adversaries in the mud, I see the countless legion of theologians, Christian preachers, teachers and writers, eager to enlarge on striking themes of the carnal Jew, the lustful Jew,

the covetous Jew, the Jew possessed of the devil, the accursed Jew, the Jew as a murderer of the prophets, and of Christ, the Jew guilty of deicide—all conscientiously endeavouring in all good faith to propagate these false, pernicious and deadly ideas; all equally ready, it follows logically, to admit with Chrysostom that if the hateful Jew received as his share exile, dispersion, servitude, misery and shame it was only justice (God's justice): he had to pay his forfeit. But these are only figures of speech you will say today—1,600 years later—to reassure your conscience; that may be so but 'one must understand' to what end figures of speech uttered by a 'golden mouth' may lead, taken up in chorus across the centuries by myriads of disciples; the figures of speech took vital and virulent root, they are encrusted in millions of souls. Who then would dare to believe that the Christian soul is free from them today? Who can tell if it will ever be freed? Look at the hideous lampoonists, the Streicher Nazis, who followed after the Christian preachers."

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, pp. 162, 164-6)

Less violent than the Greek orator, according to Jules Isaac, St. Augustine:

"... is equally hostile towards Judaism and the Jews, and equally determined to fight their persistent influence, to protect the faithful from it, and to provide them with a stock of valid arguments to use in controversy with these obstinate reprobates. He uses the same method, and their point of view and interpretation of the Scriptures is similar: long before the coming of the Saviour, Judaism had progressively become corrupt, faded and withered; after the revelation of Christ, it fell completely under Satan's inspiration; formerly the chosen children of God, they became the sons of the devil.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 166)

"In all this passionate teaching which has survived the centuries and which still in our day dares to lift its voice, there is no more respect for Biblical truth than for historical truth. Both the deplorable Crucifixion and the Dispersion are fearlessly used as weapons cruelly sharpened in order the better to do to death old Israel. . . .

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 167)

"But most important of all is St. Augustine's own particular doctrinal contribution, the elaboration, in his sharp mind, of an ingenious, opportune thesis destined to the greatest (theological) success: the doctrine of the Witness-People. . . .

"If the Jews who refused to believe in Christ nevertheless continue to exist, it is because they must do so, because God in his supernatural wisdom has so ordained it; they continue to exist in order to bear witness to Christian truth, and they bear witness to it both by their sacred books and by their Dispersion.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 168)

"Oh marvellous discovery of a subtle, creative genius: the astonishing survival of the Jewish people can only be ascribed to one object and one reason, to testify to the antiquity of biblical tradition and the authenticity of the sacred texts on which the Christian faith is founded; the blind (and 'carnal') Jews themselves do not understand the real meaning of their holy Scriptures, but they preserve them piously and reverently for the use of the Church, to whom, in other words, they are nothing more than enslaved 'book-rests' walking behind their master. Similarly, the Dispersion of the Jewish people, while not losing its significance as the chastisement brought down by God in punishment for the Cross of Christ, itself bears witness and corresponds to the designs of providence since it proves everywhere that the Jews continue to exist 'for the salvation of the nations and not for the salvation of their own', and thus serves to spread the same Christian faith which the Jews persist in denying.

"Such, in broad outline, is St. Augustine's theme.

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, pp. 168-9)

"There is a corollary to these augustinian propositions, a corollary which is rendered formidable by its practical implications. The witness which the Jews bear (in favour of Christian truth) by their survival and by their dispersion, they should also bear by their visible downfall. The efficacy of their witness will be measured in terms of the harshness of the lot which has been reserved for them. . . .

"The teaching of contempt", adds Jules Isaac, "leads to the system of vilification which is its necessary justification.

"Henceforward we perceive the radical difference which separates the Christian system of vilification from its modern Nazi imitator—blind and ignorant are they who ignore their thousand profound connections: the latter was only a stage, a brief stage preceding the massive extermination; the former on the contrary involved survival, but a shameful survival in contempt and disgrace; thus it was created to endure and to injure and slowly torture millions of innocent victims. . . ."

(Jules Isaac: *ibid.*, pp. 166-8, 171-2)

One is tempted to say that all exaggerations are valueless after reading such shameless slanders against the teaching of the Church. Our reply is given a few pages later. Meanwhile, says Jules Isaac:

"Let us first of all examine the doctrinal teaching of the Church in this period of the early Middle Ages. No more perfect expression of it is to be found than in the masterpiece of St. Gregory the Great, who comes half-way between St. Augustine and St. Agobard, at the end of the sixth century. After the Church Fathers, no work commanded more attention in Christendom, especially in Western Catholicism. No example could be more conclusive since . . . this great Pope, far from being a fanatic, is renowned for his remarkable qualities of generosity, moral elevation, equity and humanity.

"Gregory the Great never systematically defined his doctrinal position with regard to Judaism . . . but a Catholic theologian, V. Tollier, who has made a special, conscientious study of his work, came to this conclusion, which reference to the texts themselves would qualify as acceptable: 'He envisaged the history of this people as an enormous error, prepared at great length, committed in cold blood, rigorously punished, to be effaced one day by divine mercy.' For having treated God 'with the blackest ingratitude', 'the chosen people became accursed . . . ; it will only arouse itself from its fatal slumbers at the last days of the world.'

"Gregory the Great could only follow existing tradition, firmly established by the Fathers of the fourth century. But let it be said to his credit that he never lost sight of the Jewish origins of the early Church, or of the Pauline vision of the final reconciliation—deferred by him (not by St. Paul) to the last days of the world; that he was not a party to the unjust and deadly accusation of 'deicide'; that while underlining the guilt of the majority of the Jews for the Passion, he never completely omitted the share in it borne by the procurator Pilate and the Romans; that it was he indeed who formulated the pre-eminently Christian idea—which was to dominate the spirit and the heart of all believers in Christ and which is taught in the catechism of the Council of Trent—of the universal responsibility of sinful humanity; and that finally, anti-Jewish controversy in his writings nowhere degenerates into the outrageous and scurrilous outbursts after the example of St. John Chrysostom.

"One is therefore all the more struck by the strict severity with which this great Pope, this noble person, speaks of Judaism and the Jewish people, and re-iterates themes that are mainly traditional without verifying their foundations. . . .

"'Drunk with pride (writes the great Pope) the Jews have bent all their energy on closing their minds to God's representatives. . . . They lost humility and with it the understanding of the truth.'

"Like the fourth Evangelist, Gregory incessantly abuses the term the Jews to draw attention to the clique of Jesus' enemies, which amounts to condemning the whole of the Jewish people to the contempt and hatred of the faithful: 'The Jews handed over the Lord and accused him. . . .' (Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, pp. 289-90)

"'The finest examples failed to move this vulgar nation to serve God with love, not fear . . . Israel's faith consisted only in obeying the divine precepts to the letter . . . they became not a means for sanctification but a source of pride. . . . To rise up to God, Israel had the wings of the Law, but her heart, crawling in the lowest depths on earth, held her down. . . . The infidel people only understood the incarnation of God in the flesh, and would not accept him as more than a man . . . thus the spouse, given up to carnal judgment, failed to recognise the mystery of the Incarnation.'"

(St. Gregory the Great, quoted by Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, pp. 289-90)

Jules Isaac continues:

"This theme of the 'carnal people' is infinitely dangerous since it leads inevitably to that of the people of 'the Beast', of 'the antichrist' and of 'the devil' actuated by perverse, diabolical hatred against God and his supporters. (ibid., p. 290)

"'Because the hearts of the Jews are without faith,' said St. Gregory, 'they have submitted to the devil . . . the Synagogue is not only unwilling to accept the faith, but has fought it with the sword and has raised up against it the horrors of a merciless persecution . . . is it not true to say that the Beast has made his den in the hearts of Jewish persecutors? . . . the more the Holy Spirit filled the world the more perverse hatred enchained the souls of the Jews; their blindness has made them cruel and their cruelty has driven them to implacable persecution'.

(St. Gregory the Great, quoted by Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 290)

"Such is the teaching of the great Pope, in his opinion conciliatory and of a purely doctrinal nature, consistent with one's duty to humanity, Christian charity and respect for the law. It is his opinion, perforce not others'. For it was to leave in mediocre

hearts and minds, everywhere and always in the majority, a stigma branded on the forehead of the Jewish people of its crimes, its curse, its satanic perverseness. It is all that is required today, or at any time, to unleash the savagery of 'the Beast'."

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 291)

Jules Isaac now turns to St. Agobard.

"The first point to note about Agobard is that his anti-Judaism is essentially ecclesiastical and theological, like the Church Fathers'; it doesn't spring from what Mr. Simon calls the vein of popular anti-Semitism. . . . (Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 274)

"In conflict with the Jews, Agobard appealed directly to the emperor in two letters; *de insolentia Judaeorum* (On the Insolence of the Jews), and *de judaïcis superstitionibus* (On Jewish Superstitions).

"In the former, Agobard sets out a justification of his attitude and of the anti-Jewish measures which he has taken. It was easy for him to show that in denouncing the perfidia Judaeorum he was only obeying the precepts taught by the Fathers and the rules established by the Church. These precepts and rules, he assures the emperor, accord with reason and charity: 'Since the Jews live among us, and since we must not treat them spitefully nor do injury to their life, their health and their fortune, let us observe the moderation prescribed by the Church, which is to behave with prudence and humanity towards them. . . .'

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 278)

"The whole of his work, which is based on the Church Fathers—principally St. Ambrose—on the decisions of the Councils and on the Scriptures, tends to demonstrate that the Jews ought to be kept strictly apart, as a people whose society was the worst defilement a Christian could endure. Antichrists, sons of the devil, 'the impious Jews, enemies of the Son of God, themselves cut themselves off from the true house of David, the Church; all the divine threats and maledictions have been fulfilled with regard to the Synagogue of Satan'. There is nothing new in this; Agobard is merely repeating the habitual formulas, or rituals, as one might call them, of the teaching of contempt: banning the Jews from Christian society is one of the masterpieces of the system of vilification.

"To superstition, according to Agobard, the Jews add blasphemy and slander, and he gives examples of outrageous accounts of the

life of Jesus spread abroad by Jews. It is indeed known that a detestable Jewish tradition to this effect sprang up in the second century, later to be recorded in the books of the Sepher Toledot Jeschu—the version Agobard quoted is akin to them, if not absolutely identical. These contemptuous, libellous stories are as indefensible as the manifold insults of certain Christian orators directed against the synagogue and the Jewish faith. Agobard himself does not deny it.”

(Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, p. 280)

Jules Isaac concludes in these words:

“Agobard’s attitude cannot be justified by putting forward the evils which the Jews or certain Jews may have committed, nor is it in accordance with ‘reason’ or ‘wisdom’ or ‘Christian charity’ to treat them all as Pariahs, to denounce them in public as the enemies of God, to call their sanctuaries synagogues of Satan and themselves a people cursed to their very bowels, with whom all contact ought to be avoided as the worst pollution. . . .

“For, and I will repeat it again and again, such teaching, hurled from the roof-tops to flocks of ignorant and credulous faithful leads not only to ‘violent injustice’, but to even more odious consequences, to criminal acts of homicide and genocide, to massive assassinations and monstrous ‘pogroms’. It is too simple to believe or to let people believe that the most violent vocal outbursts are harmless, as if there was no risk that violent words would lead men to violent acts. Which is more to blame, the tongue’s insults or the arm’s blows? In spite of his apologists, ‘St. Agobard’ must bear his part of the responsibility.” (Jules Isaac, *ibid.*, pp. 284-5)

In other words, according to Jules Isaac, the Evangelists were liars, St. John Chrysostom is a delirious theologian and a scurrilous pamphleteer, St. Augustine uses his sharp, subtle mind to falsify the facts, Pope St. Gregory the Great invented the “formidable theme of the ‘carnal people’, which has unleashed the savagery of the Beast against the Jews throughout history”, and St. Agobard, the celebrated Primate of Gaul, hurled “from the roof-tops to flocks of the faithful a teaching which leads to the most odious consequences, to crimes of genocide, to massive assassinations and to monstrous pogroms.”

All persecutors, filled with anti-Jewish hatred, the veritable fore-runners of Streicher and others, morally responsible for “Auschwitz” and “six million innocent Jewish victims”.

Thus, Jules Isaac denounces this, asserts that, and then condemns the great doctors without attempting to analyse any of the reasons which led them all, each of different character and origin—Jewish,

Greek and Latin—and each raised by the Church to the altar, to make such stern and weighty accusations against the Jews.

He asked, or rather insisted that the Council:

Condemn and suppress all racial, religious or national discrimination with regard to the Jews;

Modify or suppress liturgical prayers concerning the Jews, especially those on Good Friday;

Declare that the Jews are in no way responsible for the death of Christ, for which the whole of humanity is to blame;

Quash the passages, in the Evangelists, and principally the one in St. Matthew, whom Jules Isaac coldly describes as a liar and perverter of the truth, in which they relate the crucial story of the Passion;

Declare that the Church has always been to blame for this state of latent war which has persisted for two thousand years between the Jews, the Christians and the rest of the world;

Promise that the Church will definitely modify her attitude to a spirit of humility, contrition and forgiveness with regard to the Jews, and that she will make every effort to repair the wrongs that she has done them by rectifying and purifying her traditional teaching according to the lines laid down by Jules Isaac.

Notwithstanding the insolence of his ultimatum and of his virulent indictment of the Evangelists and of the teaching of the Fathers of the Church, which is founded on the very words of Christ himself, Jules Isaac received strong support from priests even in Rome and from many members of *Amitié judéo-chrétienne*.

On 23rd January 1965, the weekly paper, *Terre de Provence*, which is published at Aix, reported that Mgr. de Provençères, Bishop of Aix, had given an address to the “*Amitié judéo-chrétienne*” on the occasion of the inauguration of the Jules Isaac avenue which took place that morning, and the following passage is taken from the article:

“A large crowd had gathered in the Zironski amphitheatre to hear the address which Mgr. de Provençères was to give on the subject of ‘The Council decree on relations between Catholics and non-Catholics.’

“The rural dean, Father Palanque, first of all recalled the moving ceremony that had taken place that morning in the presence of the Mayor, Mr. Mouret, and of Mr. Schourski and Mr. Lunel, president of the Friends of Jules Isaac. The latter’s name would again be on their lips in connection with the third session on the Council schema of Vatican II. Mgr. de Provençères would be able to give them the benefit of his knowledge which he had obtained at first hand when attending the Council.

"Mgr. de Provençères told us how happy he was to describe his experiences since he had found the work at the Council very rewarding.

"Speaking of Jules Isaac, he told us that ever since he first met him in 1945 he had had a profound regard for him, which very quickly turned to affection. The Council schema appeared to be a solemn ratification of the points they had discussed together. It originated in a petition which Jules Isaac had addressed to the Vatican, which has been studied by more than two thousand bishops. The initiative which led to this event had been taken by a layman, a Jew. Mgr. de Provençères then remarked that great events in history often began in this way, subsequently to be sanctified; the meeting between Jules Isaac and John XXIII had been a gesture of the *Amitié judéo-chrétienne*.

"Mgr. de Provençères then gave a detailed account of the role played by Jules Isaac at Rome in the preparation of the Council, and the dean, Fr. Palanque, thanking Mgr. de Provençères, outlined the work which the Bishop of Aix had done to ensure the successful passage of the schema."

While on the subject of Judaeo-Christian friendship it is instructive to note the haughty and contemptuous irony with which Joshua Jehouda, one of the spiritual leaders of contemporary Judaism, refers to it:

"The current expression 'Judaeo-Christian' is an error which has altered the course of universal history by the confusion it has sown in men's minds, if by it one is meant to understand the Jewish origin of Christianity; for by abolishing the fundamental distinctions between Jewish and Christian messianism, it seeks to bring together two ideas that are radically in opposition. By laying the accent exclusively on the 'Christian' idea to the detriment of the 'Judean' it conjures away monotheistic messianism—a valuable discipline at all levels of thought—and reduces it to a purely confessional messianism, preoccupied like Christian messianism with the salvation of the individual soul. If the term 'Judaeo-Christian' does point to a common origin, there is no doubt that it is a most dangerous idea. It is based on a 'contradictio in adjecto' which has set the path of history on the wrong track. It links in one breath two ideas which are completely irreconcilable, it seeks to demonstrate that there is no difference between day and night or hot and cold or black and white, and thus introduces a fatal element of confusion to a basis on which some, nevertheless, are endeavouring to construct a civilisation. Christianity offers to the world a limited messianism which it wishes to impose as the

only valid one. . . . Even Spinoza, who was further than any other thinker from the historic messianism of Israel, wrote: 'As for what certain churches say, that God assumed human nature, I must confess that this seems to me as absurd as saying that a circle assumed the shape of a square. . . .'

"The dogmatic exclusiveness professed by Christianity must finally end. . . . It is the obstinate Christian claim to be the sole heir to Israel which propagates anti-Semitism. This scandal must terminate sooner or later; the sooner it does, the sooner the world will be rid of the tissue of lies in which anti-Semitism shrouds itself."

(Joshua Jehouda: *l'Antisémitisme Miroir du Monde*, pp. 135-6)

The author's attitude would appear to be clear from the above, but let us illustrate it further:

"The Christian faith flows from a myth connected with Jewish history but not with the precise tradition which it has transmitted in the Law—both written and by word of mouth—as is the case with Israel.

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 132)

"However, Christianity claims to bring to the world the 'true' messianism. It seeks to convert all the pagans including the Jews. But as long as the monotheistic messianism of Israel persists, and is present even though it does not manifest itself openly . . . Christian messianism appears as what it is in reality: an imitation which collapses in the light of the authentic messianism."

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 155)

It is the author's sincere hope that Christians who enter Judaeo-Christian circles of friendship are profoundly versed not only in the mysteries of their own faith but of that of the Jewish people, so that they understand their fundamental "contradictio in adjecto", and hence do not attempt to bring together two ideas that are radically in opposition.

However, when Jules Isaac and his associates went to Rome, they were careful not to mention these passages in their books; they spoke of Christian charity, of ecumenical unity, of common biblical filiations, of Judaeo-Christian friendship, of the struggle against racism, of the martyrdom of the Jewish people, and their efforts met with success, since 1,651 bishops, cardinals, archbishops and Council Fathers voted to reform Catholic teaching according to the desires of Jules Isaac, the B'nai B'rith and the World Jewish Congress.

Naturally, when they went to Rome to prepare the Council vote, Jules Isaac and the leaders of the Jewish organisations did not tell the Pope and the bishops:

"Your Evangelists are rank liars.

"Your Church Fathers are perverters and torturers who have spread throughout the world the hatred of the Jew and unleashed the savagery of the Beast.

"They are the precursors of Hitler and Streicher, and it is they who are veritably responsible for Auschwitz and the six million Jewish dead, victims of the Germans."

These accusations can be read in their complete and unabridged form in Jules Isaac's books, which are available in any bookshop, but apparently the Council Fathers have not read them, any more than they have read the works of Jehouda, Rabi, Benamozegh, Memmi and others.

No, Jules Isaac and the leaders of the great Jewish organisations did not say, in company with Joshua Jehouda, one of the masters of contemporary Jewish thought: Your monotheism is a false monotheism; it is a bastard imitation and a falsified version of the only true monotheism which is Hebrew monotheism, and if Christianity does not return to Jewish sources it will be finally condemned. (Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, pp. 155, 260, 349)

They did not say in company with Benamozegh, who is one of the glories of contemporary Jewish thought: The Christian religion is a false, so-called divine religion. Its only hope of salvation, as for the rest of the world, is to return to Israel. (Elie Benamozegh: *Israel et l'Humanité*)

They did not say in company with Memmi:

"Your religion is a blasphemy and a subversion in the eyes of the Jews. Your God is to us the Devil, that is to say, the symbol and essence of all evil on earth."

(A. Memmi: *Portrait of a Jew*, pp. 188-9)

They did not say in company with Rabi:

"The conversion of the Jews to Christianity is treason and idolatry since it involves the supreme blasphemy, the belief in the divinity of a man."

(Rabi: *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, p. 188)

They took care not to arouse fears at Rome by unveiling their thoughts, and they succeeded in gaining a certain number of prelates to their cause.

All this is undoubtedly a strange story.

It may be true that there are a certain number of progressive bishops who, out of hostility towards traditional Catholicism, are perhaps prepared to use any weapons against it. But it is not unreasonable to imagine that they constitute a minority. How then does one explain their success?

It stems from two reasons:

Firstly, the vast majority of the Council Fathers are unaware of the role played by the Jewish organisations and Jules Isaac in the preparation of this vote: they had not read the latter's works;

And secondly, in general, the Council Fathers are not well informed on the Jewish question and they readily accept Judaic arguments, which are skilfully presented by formidable debaters such as Jules Isaac.

However that may be, the manoeuvre was carried out with the utmost adroitness and it succeeded. The vote itself is there in witness to this fact.

One thousand six hundred and fifty-one Council Fathers considered that Jules Isaac's version of the Passion was preferable to St. John's and to St. Matthew's.

One thousand six hundred and fifty-one bishops, archbishops and cardinals admitted that the teaching of St. John Chrysostom, of St. Augustine, of St. Gregory the Great, of St. Ambrose and of St. Agobard should be purified and rectified to conform with the injunctions of Jules Isaac, whose *Jésus et Israël* was recently described by the Jewish writer, Rabi, as "the most specific weapon of war against a particularly harmful Christian doctrine", that is to say, the doctrine codified by the above-mentioned Fathers of the Church. (Rabi: *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, p. 183)

The modification of the Good Friday liturgy and the suppression of, among others, the prayer of the *Impropria* by the 1,651 bishops is an admission that Jules Isaac was right when he said, describing the *Impropria*

"It is difficult to say which is more striking: its beauty or its iniquity." (Jules Isaac: *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, p. 309)

Apparently the bishops considered that the iniquity of this prayer prevailed over its beauty.

In brief, the vote of 20th November 1964, apparently taken in the spirit of Christian charity and in the desire for reconciliation between the Churches and for ecumenical unity, in fact represented a step away from traditional Christianity.

After discussing the intricate question of Judaeo-Christian friendship—Jules Isaac's masterpiece, warmly supported by the Cardinals

Feltin, Gerlier and Liénart—let us return to the heart of the subject, the part played by Jules Isaac and Jewish organisations in the Council vote.

We have reproduced long extracts from Jules Isaac because he is the theoretician and spokesman in this campaign against Christian teaching, but he is not alone in this field. Powerful organisations such as the B'nai B'rith and the World Jewish Congress have lent their support.

On the 19th November 1963, *Le Monde* published the following article:

"The Jewish international B'nai B'rith organisation has expressed the desire of establishing closer relations with the Catholic Church. It has just submitted to the Council a declaration asserting the responsibility of the whole of humanity for the death of Christ.

"Mr. Label Katz, President of the International Council of the B'nai B'rith, said that 'if this declaration is accepted by the Council, Jewish communities will explore ways and means of co-operating with the authorities of the (Catholic) Church to ensure the realisation of its purpose and projects.'

"The declaration was approved by the Executive Committee of the International Council, the co-ordinating mechanism of the 475,000 strong B'nai B'rith organisation, which has members in forty-two countries.

"Mr. Paul Jacob of Mulhouse, the President of B'nai B'rith in Europe, said that the approval of this declaration would strike a blow at the roots of anti-Semitism in many European countries.

"Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, President of the Union of Jewish Congregations in America, appealed on Saturday to the 4,000 delegates of the forty-seventh general assembly of American Reform Judaism to revise their judgment on Christianity and erroneous view-points about Christ."

Important personalities, leaders of contemporary Jewish thought, such as Joshua Jehouda in his book *L'Antisémitisme*, *Miroir du Monde*, have advanced similar arguments on the need to reform and purify Christian teaching:

"Christianity obstinately refuses to recognise Israel as its spiritual equal. . . . The belief that Christianity offers 'the fullness' of Judaism, that it is its culminating peak, that Judaism has been fulfilled by Christianity, vitiates the very roots of universal monotheism, weakens the foundations of Christianity itself and exposes it to successive crises. If Christianity is to overcome its present

crisis it must raise itself spiritually to authentic monotheism. The hour is coming when it will be necessary to cleanse the Christian conscience by the doctrine of universal monotheism.

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, pp. 10, 11)

"It cannot be denied that anti-Semitism constitutes the chronic disease of Christianity. It must be studied in terms of the crisis in Christian civilisation and not in terms of the qualities or defects of the Jews, which bear no relation to it.

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 14)

"In the field of anti-Semitism, it is the attitude of Christians which is determinative above all else. The Jews are only its innocent victims.

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 13)

"Over the centuries Christianity has incurred a debt of honour towards Israel. Whether this debt of honour has fallen due is the question implicitly propounded by this book. On a negative or affirmative answer to this question depends the spiritual evolution of Christianity, or, to put it more clearly, peace between the peoples."

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 15)

Joshua Jehouda, Jules Isaac, the B'nai B'rith, the World Jewish Congress: from their evidence it is clear that world Judaism has for years been carrying out a carefully prepared and concerted campaign which resulted in the recent vote at the Council.

In reality, under the guise of ecumenical unity, religious reconciliation and other plausible pretexts, its object is the demolition of the bastion of traditional Catholicism, which is described by Joshua Jehouda as "the decrepid fortress of Christian obscurantism".

According to Jehouda, there have been three attempts to "rectify Christianity", three attempts "aimed at purging the Christian conscience of the miasmas of hatred", three attempts "to amend the suffocating, paralysing effects of Christian theology", and "three breaches have been opened in the decrepid fortress of Christian obscurantism"—that is to say, three important stages have been accomplished in the work of the destruction of traditional Christianity, and they are:

The Renaissance;
The Reformation;
The Revolution of 1789.

Although he does not say so in as many words, it is quite plain, as several extracts will serve to make abundantly clear, that what

Jehouda finds so admirable in these three great movements is the work of dechristianisation to which each, in different ways, made a powerful contribution.

"The Renaissance, the Reformation and the Revolution constitute three attempts to rectify Christian mentality by bringing it into tune with the progressive development of reason and science . . . and as and when dogmatic Christianity relaxes, the Jews gradually free themselves from control."

Speaking of the Renaissance, he informs us that:

"We can say that if the Renaissance had not been deflected from its original course for the benefit of the Greek world, the world would have doubtless been unified by the creative thought and doctrine of the Cabala."

(Joshua Jehouda: *L'Antisémitisme, Miroir du Monde*, p. 168)

And this is what he says about the Reformation:

"With the Reformation, which broke out in Germany fifty years after the Renaissance, the universality of the Church was destroyed . . . (before Luther and Calvin) John Reuchlin, the disciple of Pico de Mirandola, shook the Christian conscience by suggesting, as early as 1494, that there was nothing higher than hebraic wisdom. . . . Reuchlin advocated returning to Jewish sources as well as ancient texts. Finally, he won his case against the convert Pefferkorn, who loudly demanded the destruction of the Talmud. The new spirit which was to revolutionise the whole of Europe . . . became apparent with regard to the Jews and the Talmud. . . . However, one is astonished to find that there were as many Protestant as Catholic anti-Semites."

In short, Jehouda concluded, "the Reformation marks the revolt against the Catholic Church, which is already a revolt in itself against the religion of Israel".

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, pp. 169-72)

As for the French Revolution:

"The third attempt to amend the Christian position, after the failure of reformed Christianity to unite, took place under the impetus of the French Revolution . . . which marked the beginning of atheism in the history of Christian peoples. Declaredly anti-religious, this Revolution continues, through the influence of Russian Communism, to make a powerful contribution to the dechristianisation of the Christian world."

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, pp. 170-2)

Finally, the work of the "rectification of Christian mentality" was crowned by Karl Marx and Nietzsche, for

"... in the nineteenth century two new attempts were made to purify the mentality of the Christian world, one by Marx and the other by Nietzsche". (Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 187)

Thus "the profound meaning of history, which remains unaltered in every epoch, is that of a veiled or open struggle between the forces working for the advancement of humanity and those that cling to coagulated interests, obstinately determined to keep them in existence to the detriment of what is to come". (Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 186)

In the eyes of these thinkers, the reforms proposed by the Council ought to represent a new stage in the abandonment, resignation and destruction of traditional Catholicism.

We are in fact witnessing a new struggle in the millenary confrontation between Jews and Christians. Jehouda, Rabi, Benamozegh and Memmi depict it in the following terms:

"Christianity", says Jehouda, "obstinately refuses to recognise Israel as its spiritual equal . . . the belief that Christianity offers the 'fullness of Judaism', that it is its culminating peak, that Judaism has been fulfilled by Christianity, vitiates the roots of universal monotheism, weakens the foundations of Christianity itself and exposes it to successive crises . . . the hour is coming when it will be necessary to cleanse the Christian conscience by the doctrine of universal monotheism."

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, pp. 10-11)

"Christian anti-Semitism, while proclaiming itself messianic, also claims to replace the messianism of Israel with faith in a crucified God who will secure the salvation of the souls of all the faithful. By lowering Jewish messianism to the level of paganism, Christianity tends to convert all the Jews to a reduced form of messianism. . . . But as long as the monotheistic messianism of Israel persists . . . Christianity appears as what it is in reality: an imitation which collapses in the light of the authentic messianism . . . (and) anti-Semitism will persist as long as Christianity refuses to face its real problem, which may be traced back to its betrayal of monotheistic messianism."

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, pp. 154-60)

And again:

"It is the obstinate Christian claim to be the sole heir to Israel which propagates anti-Semitism. This scandal must terminate

sooner or later; the sooner it does, the sooner the world will be rid of the tissue of lies in which anti-Semitism shrouds itself."

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 136)

Now let us hear Elie Benamozegh, one of the masters of Jewish thought today:

"If Christianity consents to reform itself upon the Hebrew ideal it will always be the true religion of the gentile peoples.

(Elie Benamozegh: *Israel et l'Humanité*, p. 18)

"The religion of the future must be based on some positive and traditional religion, invested with the mysterious prestige of antiquity. But of all the ancient religions Judaism is unique in claiming to possess a religious ideal for all humanity (for) . . . the work (of Christianity) is only a copy which must be placed face to face with the original . . . since it (Judaism) is the indisputed mother (of Christianity), it is the more ancient religion which is destined to become the most modern.

"As opposed to Christianity . . . with its claim to divine origin and infallibility . . . and in order to replace an authority which proclaims its infallibility and which only begins at year one of the Christian era or of the Hegira . . . another, much more important infallibility must be found which, taking its origin from the history of man on earth, will only end with him.

(Elie Benamozegh, *ibid.*, pp. 34-35)

"The reconciliation dreamt of by the early Christians as a condition of the Parousia, or final coming of Jesus, the return of the Jews to the bosom of the Church, without which, as all the Christian communions agree, the work of Redemption is incomplete, this return we say will take place not in truth as it is expected to happen, but in the only genuine, logical and lasting fashion possible, and above all in the only way in which it will benefit the human race. It will be a reunion between the Hebrew religion and the others that have sprung from it and, according to the last of the Prophets, the Light of the Seers, as the Doctors call Malachi, it will be 'the return of the children's heart to their fathers'."

(Elie Benamozegh, *ibid.*, p. 48)

Rabi has this to say:

"There is", he tells us, "an irremediable difference between Jews and Christians. It is to do with Jesus. If we take it that he did exist in history, for the Jew he was neither God nor the son

of God. The most extreme concession the Jew can possibly make was expressed by Joseph Klauzner, according to whom Jesus, whom he said was neither the Messiah, nor a Prophet, nor a law-giver, nor the founder of a religion, nor Tanna, nor rabbi, nor pharisee, 'is considered as a great moralist and artist in the use of parables by the Jewish nation . . . the day when he is cleared of the stories of his miracles and mysticism, the Book of the Morality of Jesus will become one of the most precious jewels of Jewish literature of all time'.

(Rabi: *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, p. 204)

"Sometimes I see in my mind the last Jew alive standing before his creator in the last century as it is written in the Talmud: 'The Jew, bound by his oath, remains standing since Sinai.' What, I imagine, will this last Jew, who will have survived the outrages of history and the appeals of the world, what will he say then to justify his resistance to the usury of time and the pressure of men? I hear him say: 'I do not believe in the divinity of Jesus.' It is quite understandable that the Christian is scandalised by this profession of faith. But are we not scandalised by the Christian's profession of his faith?

"For us, he says, 'conversion to Christianity is necessarily idolatrous because it involves the supreme blasphemy, the belief in the divinity of a man'."

(Rabi, *ibid.*, p. 188)

The above was written in the last ten years. Let us now go back two thousand years and re-read the account of the Passion.

"And they that had laid hold on Jesus led him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders were assembled. . . .

"Now the chief priests and elders and all the council sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death; but found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. And at last came two false witnesses, and said. This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God and to rebuild it in three days. And the high priest arose and said unto him: Answerest thou nothing? What is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him: I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him: Thou hast said it; nevertheless I say unto you, hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

"Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying: He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? Behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy, what think ye? They answered and said: He is guilty of death."

(The Gospel according to St. Matthew xxvi. 57-66)

St. Luke describes the trial as follows: Jesus is being interrogated by the chief priests before the scribes and elders:

"Art thou the Christ? Tell us. And he said unto them: If I tell you, you will not believe, and if I also ask you, you will not answer me nor let me go. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.

"Then said they all: Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them: Ye say that I am. And they said: What need we any further witness, for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth?"

(The Gospel according to St. Luke xxii. 67-71)

St. Mark's account is very similar to St. Matthew's.

After two thousand years the situation—one of unyielding opposition between Jews and Christians—still remains unchanged.

In conclusion it may not be amiss to relate a strange event which happened recently, involving the barrister, Hans Deutsch, an important and respected member of the Jewish Community in Germany. It was he who had intervened with Pope Paul VI in support of Jules Isaac's thesis in favour of the Jews, which brought about the Council vote.

On 3rd November 1964 a bolt fell from the blue. Hans Deutsch was arrested at Bonn, charged with swindling the German Government.

Four days later the following account appeared in *Le Monde* under the heading: HANS DEUTSCH PLAYED AN IMPORTANT PART IN CLAIMING INDEMNITIES DUE TO THE VICTIMS OF NAZISM:

"The arrest at Bonn of Professor Hans Deutsch on the 3rd November seems to have aroused lively reaction at Berne, Vienna and other centres concerned with German compensation to the Jewish victims of Nazism. . . . The news was announced on the 4th November by a spokesman for the Public Prosecutor of the Federal Republic at Bonn. Professor Deutsch is accused of having embezzled nearly 35,000,000 marks and of having induced third parties to make false statements.

"The personality of Professor Deutsch and the circumstances of his arrest throw a disquieting light on an affair destined to create a sensation . . . Mr. Deutsch is of Austrian origin. He

left Vienna after the Anschluss and went to Palestine, from whence he returned to Europe after the war. A lawyer, he undertook to fight for the restitution of Jewish properties confiscated by the Germans, notably for those of the Austrian branch of the Rothschild family. His professional fees amounted to a considerable personal fortune, which increased with investment so that he was able to donate large sums to aid the cultural arts.

"The Professor had been received in audience by Pope Paul VI, whose aid he had requested in launching an appeal to fight prejudiced people who aggravate relations between Jews and Christians. The Pope agreed to give his support to this project, which had been inspired by the example of Jules Isaac.

"The charge brought against him has astonished the city of Vienna, where many circles have expressed their sympathy for Mr. Deutsch, in view of his cultural activities. Some reports say that Professor Deutsch was in Germany to discuss methods of raising the maximum amount of indemnities payable to the Jewish victims of Nazism."

Paris-Presse published two articles on the 8th and 13th November following the *Le Monde* story, from which the following passages have been taken:

"The Hatvany collection—one of the most superb collections of European paintings that exists—is the cause of the downfall of the Jewish Austrian barrister, Professor Hans Deutsch, who is accused of having improperly collected several million marks in the names of the victims of Nazi plundering.

"Former SS Chief, Hauptsturmführer Frederick Wilke, who is now a trouser manufacturer in Frankfurt, joined Deutsch in prison at Bonn. His evidence would have enabled the barrister to pull off the swindle of which he is accused.

"Baron Hatvany, the 'Sugar King' of Hungary, had built up a collection of 800 pictures including Rembrandts, Goyas and Degas. It disappeared during the war. The Baron died in 1958 and his three daughters instructed Professor Deutsch to obtain an indemnity from the Bonn Government. Proof was still not available that the collection had actually been stolen by the Nazis. This is where Wilke came in. He had stated before the commission of enquiry that the pictures had been removed by SS General von Pieffer-Wildenbruch and taken to Bavaria. The Bonn Government had no alternative but to pay the indemnity. After lengthy discussion the total indemnity to be paid to the Hatvany heirs was fixed at 35,000,000 marks. Deutsch received half of this sum forthwith. It was later discovered that the collection had indeed

been taken but it had not been stolen by the Nazis, but by the Russians in 1944. And this is why Deutsch was arrested when he arrived in Bonn last week to collect the balance of his 35,000,000 marks.

"He is perhaps the most accomplished crook of the century.

"The Deutsch affair is now in the hands of expert investigators. Chemists and graphologists are carefully examining in their laboratories every particle of the bulky dossier which Professor Deutsch had just submitted.

"Preliminary investigations suggest that the Professor had already spent some 20,000,000 marks preparing this dossier; for the forgeries which he produced and the attestations of witnesses etc., are veritable masterpieces. 'If our suspicions are proved correct', said a German lawyer who is closely connected with the Public Prosecutor at Bonn, 'the Deutsch affair will turn out to be one of the most gigantic swindles that have ever been seen in Germany'. For the moment Hans Deutsch had lost none of his self-confidence. 'My whole life,' he said, 'bears witness for me. Pleas for the people of Israel, literary foundations, schools, the struggle to bring together Jews and Christians, not to mention the rest—these things just cannot be imagined. I can prove,' he said, 'that I have spent the whole of my life in the service of great causes.' But was he giving with the left hand what he received with the right? Was Mr. Hyde working for Dr. Jekyll or was the Doctor only a cover for Mr. Hyde?"

PART II

THE PROBLEM OF THE AGES

THE COMPLEXITY OF THE JEWISH PROBLEM

"It is no accident that Jews have been the precursors and makers of many revolutions of thought and spirit."

Lord Sieff, Vice-President of World Jewish Congress
in article THE MEANING OF SURVIVAL.

Jewish Chronicle, 22nd July, 1966

AS soon as one begins to examine the Jewish problem a major difficulty is encountered, namely its extreme complexity.

The Jews are not only the adherents of a religion; despite the dispersion they belong to a distinct community in which the factors of race, religion and nationality are so closely interwoven that it is impossible to separate them.

But one must beware of misunderstanding these terms, for with the Jews they bear a completely different meaning from that attributed to them in ordinary language. To be precise, let us say that the definition of the Jewish race does not correspond to the usual definition of the word race; that the Jewish religion bears no similarity to any other religion; and that the concept of the Jewish nation is inapplicable to any other nation and without precedent in the history of the world.

Furthermore, the Jews confuse the realities of the problem by adopting ambiguous arguments, and at the same time many Jewish people occupy prominent positions of responsibility among the societies of the nations they have entered.

This explains why the Jews are obstinately and fanatically opposed to the Jewish question being discussed in broad daylight.

In his classic work, *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, written before the First World War, Henry Wickham Steed, a remarkably well-informed person, discussing this point, said:

Their ideal "seems to be the maintenance of Jewish international influence as a veritable imperium in imperiis. Dissimulation of their real objects has become to them a second nature, and they deplore and tenaciously combat every tendency to place the Jewish question frankly on its merits before the world."

(H. W. Steed: *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, p. 179)

We will now attempt to depict in broad outline the difficulty and complexity of the problem by resorting to the best informed writers on the question.

"The Jewish question is universal and elusive. It cannot be truly expressed either in terms of religion, nationality, or race. The Jews themselves seem destined so to arouse the passions of those with whom they come into contact that impartiality in regard to them is rare. Some Jews, indeed, regard the very recognition of the existence of a Jewish question as a confession of anti-Semitism. . . .

"Yet it may safely be said that no question deserves more earnest study. It assumes a hundred forms, reaches into unsuspected regions of national and international life, and influences, for good or evil, the march of civilisation. The main difficulty is to find a starting-point from which to approach it, a coign of vantage high enough to command a view of its innumerable ramifications. Is it a question of race or religion? It is both and more. Is it a question of economics, finance and of international trade? It is these and something besides. Are the peculiar characteristics that form at once the strength and weakness of the Jews a result of religious persecution, or have the Jews been persecuted because these characteristics have rendered them odious to the peoples that have harboured them? This is the old question whether the hen or the egg should take genealogical precedence."

(H. W. Steed, *ibid.*, pp. 145-6)

More recently Doctor A. Roudinesco has written that :

"The destiny of the Jewish people appears to the historian as a paradoxical, incredible and almost incomprehensible phenomenon. It is unique and unequalled in the history of humanity."

(Dr. A. Roudinesco: *Le Malheur d'Israël*, p. 7)

"For the whole history of the Jewish people is unique and without exception in the world. Even today it is an insoluble enigma for sociologists, philosophers and statesmen. Every culture is original and individual, but Jewish culture, the product of Jewish history, is absolutely exceptional."

(Daniel Pasmanik: *Qu'est-ce que le Judaïsme?*, p. 83)

"The Jewish people alone among the peoples of the world has subsisted for two thousand years without a historic fatherland, without a State, without a home, without a normal economy, without a central coercive power; for many centuries it has been the sport of other nations, it has suffered humiliation and persecution at their hands, and in spite of all this it has kept itself intact—surely this is one of the great enigmas which can only be explained by the thesis of the idea of the chosen people?

Whether it will always remain this way is another question. For our part, we are convinced that national values cannot be preserved indefinitely without national dignity. Only the future can solve this problem decisively." (Daniel Pasmanik, *ibid.*, p. 73)

"The people of Israel has a peculiar place in history, for it is at one and the same time religion and nation, and these two factors are absolutely inseparable, which is not the case with any other people. Obviously Israel is a race, but not in the biological sense, as the racists claim, but in an ethical, historical sense." (Joshua Jehouda: *L'Antisémitisme*, *Miroir du Monde*, p. 209)

The Rev. Bonsirven, S.J., emphasises the racial aspect of the Jewish religion in his book on Judaism in Palestine:

"Jewish nationalism . . . exists, ardent and uncompromising, in the form of a national religion, or to put it more exactly, in the form of a racial religion. This expression does not seem to make sense because it links two terms and concepts that are directly opposed to each other: the concept of religion, which is of its nature supranational and universal, and the concept of nation and race, which includes exclusiveness. Such is the fundamental, constitutional paradox harboured by Judaism."

(Rev. Bonsirven, S.J.:

Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jésus Christ)

Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Zionist Organisation, declared in 1961:

"It is totally undesirable to seek to define the Jewish people as a racial or religious community, or as a cultural or national entity. Its unique history has created a unique collective phenomenon to which none of the terms that are used in different languages to describe human groups can be applied. What matters is this: a Jew thinks of himself as an integral part of Judaism, whatever way he may describe the Jewish people."

(Quoted by Rabi: *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, p. 304)

Finally, two non-Jewish writers, one a Swiss and independent, and the other, J. Madaule, sympathetic to the Jewish people, both consider that the unity of the Hebrew people stems less from the idea of race, nation or religion than from common, essentially religious traditions:

"The difference between Judaism and every other contemporary religion is not a question of degree; it is a difference of species and nature which is fundamentally paradoxical. We are not dealing with a national religion but with a religious nationality."

(G. Batault: *Le Problème Juif*, p. 66)

"What is the exact nature of this Jewish nationality? On the one hand, it cannot be called purely religious in essence since a great number of Jews no longer practise their religion, and on the other, the other religions do not give rise to any attributes of nationality whatever. But if religion and nationality are perfectly distinct with the Jews, as they are with others, how can one explain this strange nationality unattached to any land? To the exception of all others, it is based on a common past, on common traditions which are religious in origin."

(J. Madaule: *Les Juifs et le Monde Actuel*, p. 155)

If further proof were wanted of the complexity of the Jewish problem, it is to be seen in the difficulty involved in the definition of a Jewish person in law.

Obligated to give an official answer to this question, neither Hitler, nor the Vichy Government, nor even the Israeli Government have succeeded in elaborating a clear and satisfactory definition.

By the Law of Return, the fundamental law of the new Jewish State, promulgated at Tel-Aviv in 1948, Israel gave the freedom of the country to all Jews of the Diaspora, whatever their origin. Once this had been done, the government had to work out a legal definition as to who was and who was not a Jew. Unable to find a legal formula which took into account the three factors of race, religion and nationality, the government of Tel-Aviv was obliged to have recourse to the religious criterion. A Jew is someone who belongs to a Jewish community of religion or religious traditions and who is not converted to another religion.

One does not even have to be a believer:

"Present day Judaism is not identical with religious practice. One can be Jewish, and one can be considered as such . . . without as much as sharing the Jewish faith, and notably Jewish monotheism."

(J. Madaule, *ibid.*, p. 107)

Israeli legislation is based on the strictest religious intolerance.

Indeed, conversion to another religion, particularly Christianity, automatically excludes one from the Jewish community. A Christian or Moslem Jew cannot take advantage of the Law of Return without prior naturalisation, just like any other foreigner.

"This was confirmed in December 1962 in a solemn judgment in the High Court of Israel, when the full rights of Israeli nationality were refused to a Jew converted to Christianity, who had long been living in Israel and wanted to be considered an Israeli, Father Daniel. Despite the recognised services which he has rendered the State, Father Daniel was not permitted to dispense with the formalities of naturalisation applicable in Israel to non-Jews. In other words, because he was a Christian he was not allowed to enjoy the benefit of the Law of Return to which he had appealed."

(J. Madaule, *ibid.*, pp. 65-66)

It would be the same as if an English Protestant, converted to Catholicism, ceased to be English.

In an article which appeared in *Aspects de la France* on 21st January 1965, Xavier Vallat quotes a no less typical example:

"Perhaps you believe that it is easy for a half-Jew to become an Israeli citizen. Do not be deceived. The case of Mrs. Rita Eitani, municipal counsellor of Nazareth, is instructive. Her father, a Polish Jew, was a Nazi victim. Her mother is a German Catholic, and she did not have her daughter immersed. By reason whereof the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Moshe Shapiro, requested Mrs. Eitani to give up her Israeli passport, since she was not Jewish in the terms of the law, which stipulates that the child born to a non-Jewish mother is not considered Jewish unless converted to Judaism. It is curious that Israel so rigorously applies the same method of discrimination for which it reproached the civil Statute on the Jews in France under the Vichy Government as the abomination of desolation."

Thus, paradoxical though it may seem, Israel, a lay State composed mainly of atheists and free-thinkers, is founded in law on theological concepts and religious institutions. Furthermore, not only has Hebrew, a sacred language, been made the national language, just as the Bible, a sacred book, has been made the national book, but a great number of religious practices have been preserved:

"When you see a seven-branched candlestick in the kibbutz mapam, in other words belonging to a left-wing socialist party which professes atheism, you are told that it is a national symbol. During the pascal time, it is impossible to obtain unleavened bread in Israel. It is rather as if in a country where Catholicism was the dominant religion, restaurants could only serve meat on Fridays. If by chance you light a cigarette on the Sabbath in the dining-room of the King David at Jerusalem after your meal, a

waiter will discreetly ask you to put it out, as you could give offence to some other person in the room. . . . Jews are not allowed to smoke on the Sabbath."

(J. Madaule: *Les Juifs et le Monde Actuel*, pp. 68-69)

Finally, the Law of Return does not recognise civil marriage, civil divorce or civil funerals. What, from the point of view of the Statute, is the concern of the individual, is dealt with by the interior legislation of each faith.

A lay State, practising religious intolerance, Israel, which also claims to be a democracy, is yet one of the most racially conscious States in the world. Mixed marriages are forbidden:

"Mixed marriages between Jews and non-Jews are not possible in the new State of Israel, according to the law passed on the 28th of August, 1953."

(F. Lovsky: *Antisémitisme et Mystère d'Israel*, p. 116)

In this, Israeli legislation is merely ratifying the opinion of the Rabbinical consistory:

"The conference of European Rabbis which was held in 1960 in Great Britain passed the following motion: We consider that it is our solemn duty to warn our communities and every son and every daughter of the Jewish people against the terrible evil of mixed marriages which destroys the integrity of the Jewish people and shatters family life."

(Rabi: *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, pp. 259-60)

In the State of Israel death itself does not bring peace:

"The non-Jewish husband cannot be buried in the Jewish cemetery beside his wife: apart from the case of a convert, no space may be given or sold in a Jewish cemetery to a non-Jewish person."

"In December 1957, Aaron Steinberg, the seven-year-old son of recent immigrants, died at Pardess Hanna in Israel. His father was Jewish, the mother Christian. According to Rabbinical law the child of an exogamous union takes the religion of his mother, but in canon law the child takes after the father. As a result the parents met with a refusal both from the Catholic cemetery at Haifa and the Jewish cemetery at Pardess Hanna. Although there are only religious cemeteries in Israel, a little place was secured for the body, but outside the wall."

(Rabi, *ibid.*, pp. 261-75)

It is the same racial spirit of the Law of Return which in 1948 drove back into Jordan 900,000 Arabs from Palestine.

Finally, the trial of Eichmann has set a precedent in law which may well produce grave and long-term consequences.

At the end of the Second World War, Germany was condemned to pay to the State of Israel in compensation for the wrongs she had done to German and foreign Jews indemnities amounting to 2,000,000 marks a year, and these payments, which have been made regularly, have contributed considerably to the budget of Israel.¹

In 1960 Adolf Eichmann, a German citizen who had taken refuge in Argentina, was kidnapped by Israeli secret agents, in contempt of the law of the country, and brought before an Israeli court for crimes committed, in the exercise of his office, against German and foreign Jews. He was condemned to death and executed.

By arrogating to itself the right to apply Israeli law to a German for crimes committed in Germany and which were answerable at law to the courts of his own country, the State of Israel has created a grave legal precedent.

Indeed, as Mr. Raymond de Geouffre de la Pradelle, a lawyer of international repute, pointed out in the *Figaro* on the 9th June 1960:

"The tracking down (of war criminals) by the Allies, which began the day after the war ended, was based on the agreement of London of the 8th August 1945, and the declaration of Moscow of the 30th October 1943, to which the former document expressly refers.

"The principle laid down is that war criminals shall be sent back to the country where they committed their crimes. Furthermore, the Statute of London of the 8th August 1945, set up an international Military Court to try those whose crimes were not confined to any precise geographical location.

"The Statute of London was promulgated by the Allies after they had received the power to exercise German sovereignty contained in the unconditional surrender, which was handed to them on the 8th of May, 1945, by the head of the Reich Government, Grand Admiral Doenitz.

"No international document authorises the State of Israel to

¹ In March 1965 *Le Monde* drew attention to the fact that on the expiration of the agreement which had been concluded with Israel in virtue of reparation for damages caused to the Jews, the government of Bonn will have paid out £336,168,000 (4,140 million new francs). Besides, Israel will have received goods and equipment to the value of 2,880 million N.F. (£175,392,000) from Germany. On top of this, Germany has paid indemnities to claims by individual Jewish victims which exceed the above figures.

try a foreign national to whom are imputed crimes against humanity or war crimes when these crimes were committed abroad. Furthermore, at the time when these crimes were committed, there was no question of the victims being of Israeli nationality, since the State of Israel had not then come into existence.

"The State of Israel is a sovereign power. Within the limits of the area under its jurisdiction Israel can, if she so desires, confer on herself whatever judisdictional power she thinks fit. But this law violates the general principles of law and of the international rule that competence to try crimes of an essentially international character is itself international, since, as the crimes were committed in Germany at a period when German law considered them permissible, they only constitute crimes from the point of view of international law."

Thus, in both the case of the indemnities paid by the Bonn government and of the trial of Eichmann, it is *the State of Israel which has come forward as the sole qualified representative of the Jewish community of the world, and as the sovereign State of the Jewish people throughout the world.*

Nothing could illustrate more clearly both the closeness and the ambiguousness of the ties which link the State of Israel and the Jews of the Diaspora.

The Jews have always claimed to be loyal citizens of the countries where they reside. But, as we have seen above, the indemnities and the trial of Eichmann prove that on the contrary the Jews remain strangers in the countries that receive them, and that they consider they are answerable at law, not to these countries, but to the State of Israel.

5

MOSAIC LAW AND THE TALMUD

WHEN one talks about the Jewish religion one thinks most commonly about the Mosaic law (or Pentateuch), codified in the Torah. Christianity cannot feel any particular animosity or mistrust with regard to the Pentateuch, which is one of its sacred books. It only considers that the Mosaic law has been transcended and superseded by the superior precepts of the Gospel; between the two there is consanguinity and continuity and not fundamental opposition.

"Though Torah scrolls often were trampled underfoot by screaming mobs looting synagogues, or burned with the synagogue itself, such acts were never sanctioned by the Church, and the Torah was never officially condemned. Though Judaism was reviled as a blasphemy, though Jews were killed for being unbelievers, the Torah itself was looked upon with respect, for it was the Law of God. As one Pope expressed it, 'We praise and honour the Law, for it was given to your fathers by Almighty God through Moses. But we condemn your religion and your false interpretation of the Law'."

(M. I. Dimont: *Jews, God and History*, p. 240)

But if some Jews have still remained faithful to tradition and the Torah, the majority have long since abandoned it in favour of the Talmud, a collection of commentaries on the Law compiled by the Pharisees and Rabbis between the second and the fifth century A.D. Many have become completely agnostic. Let us hear what Wickham Steed and eminent Jewish thinkers have to say about this delicate problem:

"The Sadducees struggled for centuries against the tendency to wrap Judaism in an insulating mantle of precepts and commentaries, but the fall of Jerusalem decided the struggle definitely in favour of the Pharisees, who so multiplied commentaries upon the Law that codification became indispensable. A code named Mishna (Doctrine) was elaborated. From generation to generation the Mishna commentaries grew until their volume became un-

manageable. Once more codification proved necessary. Towards the middle of the fifth century A.D. a Mishna code was formed in Palestine and, at the end of the same century, a second code at Babylon. Both codes were called 'Talmud' (Research or Investigation). While the Palestine Talmud played an insignificant part in the subsequent life of Jewry, the Babylonian Talmud was regarded as a national possession. It has remained 'The Book' for Orthodox Jewry. It replaced the Torah as the fountain of all wisdom and as the guide in every detail of daily life. The Talmud, despite its character as a commentary upon a commentary upon a Law of uncertain origin, has not only preserved the Jewish Nation but has imbued it with a Pharisee spirit and separated it, perhaps for ever, from the main stream of human culture."

(H. W. Steed: *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, pp. 164-5)

Bernard Lazare confirms this view:

"It may be said that true Mosaism, purified and enlarged by Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, broadened and generalised by the Judaeo-Hellenists, would have brought Israel to Christianity, but for Esraism, Pharisaism and Talmudism, which held the mass of the Jews bound to strict observances and narrow ritual practices. . . .

"As the Book could not be proscribed, it was belittled and made subordinate to the Talmud; the doctors declared: 'The law is water, the Mishna is wine.' And the reading of the Bible was considered less beneficial, less conducive to salvation than the reading of the Mishna. . . . (Bernard Lazare: *Anti-Semitism*, p. 17)

"It was only after all this that the rabbis ultimately triumphed. Their end was attained. They had cut off Israel from the community of nations; they had made of it a sullen recluse, a rebel against all laws, foreign to all feeling of fraternity, closed to all beautiful, noble and generous ideas; they had made of it a small and miserable nation, soured by isolation, brutalised by a narrow education, demoralised and corrupted by an unjustifiable pride.

"With this transformation of the Jewish spirit and the victory of sectarian doctors, coincides the beginning of official persecution. Until that epoch there had only been outbursts of local hatred, but no systematic vexations. With the triumph of the Rabbinites the ghettos come into being. The expulsions and massacres commence. The Jews went to live apart—a line is drawn against them. They detest the spirit of the nations amidst whom they live, the

nations pursue them. They burn the Moreh—their Talmud is burned and they themselves are burned with it."

(Bernard Lazare, *ibid.*, pp. 18-19)

In his book *Le Malheur d'Israel*, Doctor A. Roudinesco shows how the Judaism of the prophets, universal in spirit, was to end in Christianity, and how the Judaism of the Law, founded on the Talmud, was to deviate and finally break from it:

"Modern orthodoxy is not the religion of the Bible and of the Prophets. It is a post-Biblical or Talmudic religion built up by the Pharisees and doctors of the Law between the second and fifth centuries after Jesus Christ, to preserve the small minority of Jews who had not followed Christ, and to consummate the definite break from triumphant Christianity.

"The universal, messianic, finalist Judaism of the Prophets ended with Jesus, and conquered the world in the Christian form.

"Legal, national Judaism kept its God exclusively in the community of its choice, which it has striven to protect from the dangers that constantly threaten it. It is based on an interpretation of biblical texts by oral, not revealed, traditions called Mishna, Gemara, Halaka and Hagada. This collection, known as the Talmud, was first conceived of in Jerusalem towards the end of the second century and completed in Babylon in the fifth century. The two Talmuds consist of eleven volumes in octavo and are twenty times the size of the Bible."

(Dr. A. Roudinesco: *Le Malheur d'Israel*, pp. 114-15)

"This imposing collection of rabbinical works has erected a rampart of laws around Judaism and stamped it with the rigidity and lack of mobility with which it is still distinguished today.

"It is in his religion that all the elements that are specifically Jewish must be sought. Sprung from its rigid and peculiar practices, his religion isolates the Jew and confers on him the character of a sort of foreign colony, unique in its kind, living in the midst of other nations. Despite the prevalence of heterogeneousness, inbreeding and the absence of any proselytism have finally created a sort of ethnic by a process of selection.

"In contrast to the religion revealed by Abraham, and legislated by Moses, based on a national God, stands the religion of the Prophets, inspired by a universal God who was just and good. With the Prophets, the idea of morality penetrates and is incorporated into their religion. Of necessity, the national God was egoistic; he was not merciful for 'he visited the sins of the fathers on their children and on their children's children unto the

fourth generation' (Exodus xxxiv. 7). He ordered Moses and Joshua to destroy the other peoples pitilessly, and not to convert them. With the Jewish Prophets there appears for the first time in the history of humanity the idea of universal brotherhood.

(Dr. A. Roudinesco, *ibid.*, pp. 125-26)

"As from the year 725 before the present era, Isaiah, Amos, Hosea, Micah, Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel created a new religion of a spiritual and moral elevation unknown before then. It is due to them that Yahve became a universal God; and it is also due to them that Israel maintained the cult of the one God. They saved both Judaism and monotheism. One must read the Prophets to find out how far the Jewish people had been carried away by idolatry. Uncircumcised in their hearts and stiff-necked, the people were returning to their idols as the dog to his vomit. It is not without reason that the memory of manifold gold calves has survived the ages. The leaders set the example: Solomon, despite his proverbial wisdom, worshipped Astarte and Milcom and built a temple at Kemosh and Moloc opposite Jerusalem (Kings xi. 5). Jeroboam the first set up golden calves 500 years after Aaron's, Tertullian said that the Jews only practised circumcision to check the tendency to idolatry and to remind them of their true God. Under King Manasseh false Gods were worshipped in the Temple itself, which had become a veritable Pantheon. Without the Prophets the worship of Yahve might perhaps have been engulfed." (Dr. A. Roudinesco, *ibid.*, pp. 126-27)

The substitution of the Talmud for the Torah had two consequences which have never ceased to weigh heavily on the destinies of the Jewish people throughout the centuries.

Firstly, it exacerbated Jewish religious exclusiveness, which began to develop more and more into a national and political form, as F. Fejtö shows very clearly in his work, *Dieu et son Juif*:

"You above any other are the jealous people. That is your truth and your falsehood, it is your curse. . . .

"It is you who asked God not to deal with the other peoples, to repudiate all his other children.

"All or nothing was your motto, not his. Tyrannical children, you would have him all to yourselves. On the pretext of making him your only Lord, your only Master, your only King, you worked unceasingly to bring him down to your level, to dominate him, to make him the slave and instrument of your national expansion. . . .

"Nothing could be less generous or more possessive than your love of God. . . .

"To put it quite simply, you wanted to be like him, to substitute yourselves for him, to take his place. Nothing less than that!

"The idea of sharing God with others was inadmissible to you. Equally insupportable was the thought of your inequality and inferiority with regard to him. Why should he have everything and you nothing? Why should he be all-powerful and you powerless? Why can he take everything that belongs to you if it pleases him: your wives, your mother, your sisters, your daughters, your flocks, your land, while you can only bow down before the expression of his will? It is unjust, you cry. It is not a covenant between equals, it is slavery. It is not a contract, it is dictatorship. . . .

"And then there sprang up in your soul, from the depths of your collective conscience, that quarter where no man dares to venture once the night has fallen, this unutterable, monstrous dream, to make him disappear in one way or another and to substitute yourselves for him, to become like him, to be God.

"You didn't take long to transform yourselves from Adam to Cain and to kill Abel, the best among you, the one whose offering had been accepted. . . .

"While proclaiming the existence of one God of the universe the Jew obstinately persists in seeking to capture this God for himself, and to exclude all others from the covenant. . . ."

(F. Fejtö: *Dieu et son Juif*, pp. 104-109)

Bernard Lazare is no less explicit:

"With the law, yet without Israel to put it into practice, the world could not exist, God would turn it back into nothing; nor will the world know happiness until it be brought under the domination of that law, that is to say, under the domination of the Jews. Thus the Jewish people is chosen by God as the trustee of His will; it is the only people with whom the Deity has made a covenant; it is the choice of the Lord. . . .

"Israel is placed under the very eye of Jehovah; it is the Eternal's favoured son who has the sole right to his love, to his goodwill, to his special protection; other men are placed beneath the Hebrews, and it is by mere mercy that they are entitled to divine munificence, since the souls of the Jews alone are descended from the first man. The wealth which has come to the nations, in truth belongs to Israel.

"This faith in their predestination, in their election, developed

among the Jews an immense pride. It led them to view the Gentiles with contempt, often with hate, when patriotic considerations supervened to religious feelings."

(Bernard Lazare: *Anti-Semitism*, pp. 13-14)

The second consequence of the transition from the Torah to the Talmud is equally important; contrary to an opinion which throws a completely false light on the problem of the relationship of Judaism and Christianity, neither faith any longer, since that date, rest upon a common book. Indeed, they have become more and more foreign to each other.

"Christianity cannot be called a little Jewish sect which had some success, as the rabbis claim. Christianity in all its true purity and grandeur fulfilled Judaism and, by denationalising it, made it universal and human, according to the expectations of the prophets. Jesus, the man of God, incomparable and unequalled, could have been accepted as the Messiah in accordance with the eschatology and messianism of Israel. Is it for the Jews to complain if the Christians recognised God himself in this son of Israel? For two thousand years Judaism had contained the seed of Christianity in spirit. Already prophecy had pointed to a Christianity in gestation. The birth of the child was a matter of time. Having rejected its own offspring, Judaism withered and withdrew into itself in morose, proud and sterile isolation. It completely abandoned proselytism and set itself up as the national religion of a small fraction of the Jewish people.

"Paradoxical though it may seem to both Jews and Christians, it is in Christianity that the true religion of Israel was realised. The modern Jew practises a religion which is posterior to the evangelical contribution established by the doctors of the Law, on a Bible interpreted on the edge of the Revelation. Whereas the Judaism of the prophets was enriched by the message of Jesus, the Judaism of the rabbis was engulfed in the Talmud."

(Dr. A. Roudinesco: *Le Malheur d'Israel*, p. 140)

"The Judaism of the Diaspora, hellenic Judaism as it was called, which represented nine-tenths of the Jews of the Empire, liberated from the constraint of the circumcision, denationalised, open-minded and receptive, disappeared in about the fifth century, probably as a result of fusion with Christianity. Far removed from Jerusalem, it was not greatly affected by the catastrophes in the years 70 and 133. After the official creed of Jerusalem had passed away, the Palestine Jews looked upon the Jews of the dispersion as suspect from the point of view of strict orthodoxy. The rupture

between the Judaism of the Diaspora and rabbinical Judaism was the work of the scribes, the doctors and the pharisees of the Law. As from the second century, the rabbis of Babylon and Galilee elaborated a religious, political and social code known as the Talmud. This book regulated the life of the Israelite in a different spirit from that of the prophets and the Bible. If serious divergences had existed between the Old and the New Testament, the Christians would not have kept the two texts, the one following on from the other. Having rejected the Gospel, the rabbis were obliged to re-interpret the text of the old Bible. They carried out this work by means of oral traditions more or less consistent with the old texts: the Mishna and the Gemara. The result of this compilation was a new Bible; the old remains with the Christians. The Talmud is composed of eleven thick volumes. This baneful book, for the most part unintelligible, a sad wreck of the Judaism of the prophets, does not enrich the human spirit (Salomon Reinach). The aim of the Talmud was to save what remained of Israel from being absorbed by Christianity . . . the old spiritual treasure of the prophets was abandoned by the rabbinites. . . .

"While Origen, Clement of Alexandria, St. Jerome and St. Augustine were enriching Christianity, Judaism was being impoverished by the Talmud.

"The imposition of the ideals of the Talmud on the new branch of Judaism has been the calamity of the Jewish people even to this day."

(Dr. A. Roudinesco, *ibid.*, pp. 25-26)

THE MARRANOS

MEMBERSHIP of the Catholic Church is not based on race; it is solely a matter of religious faith. In the eyes of the Church, a Jewish convert is a Christian who shares to the full the privileges of membership of the Church.

"Baptism confers full membership of the Christian community without any reservations whatsoever. Conversion of the Jews was not only thought desirable but actively sought after. Once converted, they were received with joy; conversion put an end to all segregation. At the present time, however, the Jew is neither wanted nor sought after; national and racial antisemitism is much more discriminating."

(Dr. A. Roudinesco, *Le Malheur d'Israel*, pp. 42-43)

"Having recognised certain rigidly defined characteristics in each nation, modern nationalism has refused to see the Jew in any other light than that of a stranger in the land, a stateless and cosmopolitan person. No distinction at all is made between the assimilated Jew and the Jew who is conscious of his national traditions. Modern antisemitism is more illogical than that of the Middle Ages which was based on indisputable religious objections and not on unproved hypotheses and nebulous ideas.

"In as much as he is a stranger the Jew should be rejected because nationalism also harbours a hatred of foreigners."

(Dr. A. Roudinesco, *ibid.*, p. 76)

The Christian attitude in mediaeval times is well summed up in the following appeal to the Jews made by the Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand, Saint Avit:

"Remain among us and live like us or depart as quickly as possible. Give us back this land to which you are strangers; spare us your presence here, or, if you wish to remain here, share in our faith."

(F. Lovsky: *Antisémitisme et Mystère d'Israel*, p. 182)

The Jews who did not want to leave and who obstinately resisted conversion retorted by having recourse to underhand methods which led to great bitterness and caused profound uneasiness. The practise of Marranism, which was carried to great lengths in Spain, permanently envenomed relations between Jews and non-Jews.

Massoutié, a writer who has devoted two extremely interesting books to a study of the Jewish problem, has the following comment to make:

"Judaism reacted to other religions in many different ways, but the most extraordinary reaction of all . . . is undoubtedly what we will call the *phenomenon of Marranism*. This is what Werner Sombart has to say on the subject (p. 385): 'The sudden increase in the numbers of pretended conversions of Jews to paganism, to the Moslem religion, to Christianity, is such an extraordinary phenomenon, such a unique event in the history of mankind, that we cannot fail to be astonished and dumbfounded every time we come to study it.'

(L. Massoutié: *Judaïsme et Hitlérisme*, pp. 97-99)

"The Marranos were Spanish Jews in semblance converted to Christianity. It was from 1391 onwards and, according to Graetz, following religious persecution, that many Jews in Spain decided to adopt the Catholic faith. There was nothing new in this because, long before them, their ancestors of the dispersion had already had recourse to this ruse, either to escape religious persecution, or for motives of sheer material gain."

(L. Massoutié, *ibid.*, pp. 97-99)

"However that may be, while they ostensibly practised Catholicism the Marranos all the while secretly followed the rites of Judaism to which they had remained deeply attached. The Spanish people were not deceived as to the sincerity of the religious beliefs of the new Christians. With good reason the Spaniards were suspicious of them and called them Marranos, which means 'accursed, damned', or in popular language, 'swine'. An extraordinary aspect of the situation and one which I admit I fail to understand is that the Marranos were not satisfied with zealously submitting to the authority of the Church; they went much further still and carried their deceit to extreme limits. Thus it was that many of them, both men and women, did not hesitate to enter religious orders—which they were in no way obliged to do—and became monks or nuns. What is more, Marranos became priests and even bishops. If Jewish historians themselves had not told us this, we could hardly believe it.

"We can understand why the Spanish people became angry when this was discovered; it was following this discovery that the Spanish Inquisition was set up."

(L. Massoutié, *ibid.*, pp. 100-101)

"The struggle between the Inquisition and the Marranos went on for several centuries in the dark, an unparalleled, unexampled struggle, Graetz tells us, in which all the techniques of deceit and doggedness of purpose were pitted against accusations and cruelty."

(L. Massoutié, *ibid.*, pp. 103-105)

"Protestantism had its Marranos, too. Secret Jews were numerous among the Protestant refugees of the seventeenth century at the time of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, as Werner Sombart tells us. In Germany for instance, we can rate the famous poet, Henry Heine, as a Protestant Marrano. Amazing as it may seem, this is how Graetz refers to Heine and to his co-religionist, Louis Boerne, both of them converts to Protestantism. I quote from a passage in *Geschichte der Juden*, volume XI, page 368, which was omitted from the French translation by Moses Bloch:

"They were divorced from Judaism only superficially, like fighting men who put on the armour and colours of their enemy in order to strike him down and destroy him with greater certainty and vigour. What can one make of such behaviour by the sensitive author of the *Intermezzo* and the lively writer of the *Reisebilder*?"

(L. Massoutié, *ibid.*, pp. 103-105)

"In a passage of his *History of the Jews*, Graetz tells us of Spanish and Portuguese Marranos who, behind the mask of Christianity and in the habit of monks, 'jealously cherished the sacred flame of their paternal religion, and at the same time undermined the foundations of the powerful Catholic monarchy.'

"If it is only reasonable for a Jew not to give up his religion and even to preserve the worship of his race and ancestors secretly, all the while behaving as a loyal citizen in the land of his adoption, it is incomprehensible that he should take advantage of his French or German citizenship, for instance, to undermine the institutions and customs of his new fatherland; in other words, to overthrow everything. If the modern Jew was to carry out on a national level what the Marranos of old did in the field of religion, it would lead to countless disasters for Israel. Modern nations, thus irritated, would plunge into savage anti-Semitism and there would automatically arise a new Inquisition, of a different

type to be sure, but one that would perhaps be more terrible than Torquemada's.

"In my opinion, if Israel wants to avoid the worst catastrophes, it is in her interest to work in the open. Unfortunately, dissimulation is an age-old habit of hers and even the most pro-Semitic writers, such as Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, find themselves obliged to admit it."

(L. Massoutié, *ibid.*, pp. 114-15)

ASSIMILATION

THE official modern attitude in the West with regard to the Jews is based on the assertion that they are loyal citizens of the countries in which they live, and that they become completely assimilated with their surroundings. A German, French or English Jew is considered a German, a Frenchman or an Englishman of Israelite religion.

But in point of fact the Jew does not assimilate himself, or only very slowly and with great difficulty. All the specialists who have studied this aspect of the problem, whether Jewish or not are unanimous about this, at least when they are in good faith, for the attitude of the leaders of Judaism is full of ambiguity. On the one hand they demand for their own people the full rights of citizenship, but at the same time they make the utmost efforts to preserve their own specific Jewish traits and integrity.

The very principle of assimilation and its corollary, mixed marriages, is held equally suspect in both camps. Many western people are fiercely opposed to cross-breeding by the introduction of Jewish blood into their race.

The conclusions of Wickham Steed and rabbi Alfred Nossig are not calculated to allay their apprehensions:

"That Jews have a remarkable faculty for external adaptation to environment is incontestable, but it remains to be seen whether, with all their pliancy and pertinacious direction of will toward their immediate object, they are capable of adapting themselves internally. Experience and observation now extending over more than twenty-one years, in Germany, France, Italy and Austria-Hungary, incline me to answer this question in the negative.

(H. W. Steed: *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, p. 170)

"The intensity of the Jewish race character is such that the Jewish strain will persist for generations in non-Jewish families into which Jewish blood has once entered. The strain may be pro-

ductive of beauty or genius, or it may, on the other hand, bring the mental derangement so common in the better-class Jewish families."

(H. W. Steed, *ibid.*, p. 168)

Rabbi Nossig, who agrees with this opinion, wrote:

"We may talk about a biological judaisation of the civilised world . . . the minutest drop of Jewish blood influences the spiritual character of families over many generations."

(Nossig: *Integrales Judentum*)

The American Jewish writer, Ludwig Lewisohn, is, if possible, even more precise:

"The French revolution came and gradually, very gradually and sporadically, the gates of the Ghetto were opened. Contempt, servitude, restrictive laws, special taxes remained. Citizenship was not granted the Jews of England until 1832 nor the Jews of Prussia until 1847. But this gesture and similar gestures elsewhere earlier and later, more or less sincere, were supposed capable of obliterating the historic existence, consciousness, experience of a people that had been a people for three thousand years.

"This was the fallacy of the Gentiles; this is the fallacy of the unhappy assimilationist. Both he and the semibenevolent Gentile are deceived by the uniqueness of the Jewish nation. Nationhood is identified with land, armies, power. The continued existence of Jewry from the Babylonian captivity to the French Revolution, a period of roughly two thousand three hundred years, proves that there is one nation without the conventional attributes of nationhood.

"Like every other people, the English, the German, the French, the Jews are racially mixed. As Celtic, Saxon, Latin and pre-Aryan blood is found in all these peoples, or, to employ another method of differentiation, Nordic, Alpine and Mediterranean, so the Jews in their enormously long history have undergone racial intermixture. The historic process evidently transcends the question of race and shapes people by forces which we are not instructed enough to grasp. Jews differ among themselves as widely as a Tyrolean German differs from a Schleswiger, a Provençal from a Norman, a Creole from the Vermonter. They remain Jews, even as these others remain, beyond all local and racial differences. Germans, Frenchmen, Americans. A central and permanent approach to an outer and inner norm, type, group of characteristics persists. Wherever the perception of this plain fact is not arti-

ficially inhibited, it is as potent as ever. The few remaining Marranos of Spain, Spanish and outwardly Catholic for over four centuries, have applied to the Chief Rabbinate of Jerusalem for formal readmittance to Jewry. . . .

(Ludwig Lewisohn: *Israel*, pp. 33-35)

"It is assimilation that would be the miracle, the break in the eternal chain of causality . . . our assimilationist may never think a Jewish thought or read a Jewish book. In the essential character of all his passions as well as of all his actions he remains a Jew. . . .

(Ludwig Lewisohn, *ibid.*, p. 36)

"No, assimilation is impossible. It is impossible because the Jew cannot change his national character; he cannot, by wishing it, abandon himself any more than the members of any other folk can do so. . . .

(Ludwig Lewisohn, *ibid.*, pp. 38-39)

"What shall he do? Whither shall he turn? He is a Jew. He remains a Jew. The majority has discovered the fact, as it always does, sooner or later; he discovers it too. Gentile and Jew find that there is no escape. Both believed in escape. There is none. None. . . ."

(Ludwig Lewisohn, *ibid.*, p. 41)

Yet more recently, Doctor Roudinesco has written:

"The struggle against anti-Semitism on the religious level ought to be encouraged. Is the world sufficiently Christian yet to hear such a message? The religious sentiment has persisted in certain countries, Spain, Ireland, Canada and Italy for example, where there are but few Jews. Unfortunately, the Jewish problem has long ago exceeded the religious sphere, and nationalist and racist anti-Semitism is constructed on foundations far more difficult to unsettle. Then again, union on the religious level is viewed with considerable suspicion by the Synagogue, which is still afraid of conversions." (Dr. A. Roudinesco: *Le Malheur d'Israel*, p. 190)

"Legal emancipation and assimilation have failed. German Jews were the most assimilated Jews in the world, and it was in Germany that anti-Semite fury was carried to extremes.

"The problem of assimilation is a complex one. Is it even possible or compatible with upholding a religion and tradition whose character is both national and separatist? Opinions differ greatly among the Jews themselves.

"Finally there are certain cases which defy all classification. Assimilation has not disarmed anti-Semitism. Assimilated Jews are even less tolerated than the others. It was the total failure of assimilation which opened the way for Zionism."

(Dr. A. Roudinesco, *ibid.*, p. 191)

In Soviet Russia assimilation has completely failed despite the strident propaganda put out by left-wing parties that only Marxism could provide a definite solution to the problem of anti-Semitism in the world. This has been confirmed by, amongst others, Jean Paul Sartre, in a work of unutterably poor quality called *Réflexions sur la Question juive*:

"Anti-Semitism is a mythical bourgeois representation of the class struggle; in a classless society it could not exist. There would be no place for it in a society whose members are all interdependent, since they are all engaged in the same undertaking. It exhibits a certain mystic link between man and his 'goods' which is a product of the present system of property. Thus in a classless society founded on the collective ownership of the instruments of work, man, liberated from the delusions of the hither-world, will be able to devote himself to his task, which is to bring into existence the reign of humanity, and anti-Semitism will have no further justification; it will have been cut off from the roots."

(Jean Paul Sartre, *ibid.*, pp. 184-5)

In actual fact nothing of the sort has happened, as Fejtö recognises in his work *Les Juifs et l'Antisémitisme dans les pays communistes*, in which he publishes the following letter sent by a Jew in Moscow to a New York newspaper about the Moscow festival:

"The theory advocated by those who believe in assimilation (people who are either mad or unscrupulous), according to which old Jewish traditions are dead and buried, and the Jews have completely mixed with the Russians, to the greatest material benefit of both parties, and thus no longer need their own culture, has exploded like an over-inflated balloon, though in truth nobody ever doubted that it was an insecure proposition.

"Are the Jews content with Russian culture, which they can enjoy freely and at will? Today, without fear of being contradicted one can answer; No. Aspirations to Jewish art, Jewish music and the Jewish language have not been stifled by twenty years of forced assimilation. This need can be seen in the desire to see and hear the Israeli delegation, to receive some souvenir of Israel, a flower, an emblem, a ticket, a box of cigarettes. . . .

"If you ask a Jew what he thinks will be the consequences of this Festival, he will without any doubt reply that reprisals are foreseen, though it is uncertain what form they will take. They dread doing rash things, and yet the Jews gather where the concerts are to be held, driven by a force which springs from every human heart; the yearning for their own national culture."

(F. Fejtö, *ibid.*, p. 225)

At a conference on this question held by Fejtö in Brussels in September 1958, a young member of the audience got up and said:

"Assimilation—or in other words, integration with the socialist community on a basis of perfect equality—is becoming more and more difficult, if not impossible. Assimilation is a failure; from the outset it was an impossible aim to achieve; Communism would no more be able to impose it than bourgeois liberalism; the Jew's only salvation lies in Israel, in the return to the Judaic traditions, the promised Land, the reconstruction of the nation. . . ."

(F. Fejtö, *ibid.*, p. 253)

This failure is all the more remarkable considering that the Soviet régime owed its initial success to international Jewish revolutionaries and that Jewish leaders were the masters of Russia until they were progressively ousted from positions of control by Stalin and his successors.

A fatality as inexorable as the tunic of Nessus seems to cling to the Hebrew people; masters in the art of revolution, upheaval and destruction, they are powerless to create. Elie Faure depicts this trait in striking terms:

"The Jew's historic mission has been clearly defined, perhaps for all time. It will be the principal factor in every apocalyptic epoch, as it was at the end of the ancient world, and as it is now at the end, amid which we are living, of the Christian world. At these moments the Jews will always be in the forefront, both to ruin the old edifice and to mark out the terrain and materials for the new structure which is to replace it. It is this dynamic quality which is the mark of their extraordinary grandeur and perhaps also, it must be admitted, of their visible impotence.

"The Jew destroys every ancient illusion, and if he takes more share than anybody—St. Paul formerly and Karl Marx today, for example—in constructing the new illusion, precisely by reason of his eternal thirst for truth, which always survives the outcomes of political and religious struggles, he is fated to insert in the same illusion the worm which will undermine it. The patriarch

who in former times agreed to lead the human conscience towards the promised land across the glowing stretches of knowledge is not ready to lay down his formidable burden."

(Elie Faure: *La Question Juive vue par vingt-six éminentes personnalités*, p. 97)

In another passage, the Jewish scholar concludes on this subject:

"Despite reasons for hope which he accumulated in silence, could the Jew be regarded as anything other than a destroyer armed with the corrosive doubt with which Israel has always opposed the sentimental idealism of Europe since the time of the Greeks?"

(Elie Faure, *ibid.*, p. 91)

Is Zionism the solution to the problem? No, answers Dr. Roudinesco:

"The national home in Palestine does not resolve the Jewish problem. In reality it represents a new danger for Judaism. It is a cruel disappointment to the idealism of liberal Jews who, since Moses Mendelssohn, have made so many attempts at assimilation as well as for all the Jews who have poured out their blood on the battle-fields in proof of their loyalty towards their countries of adoption.

"Having fought against nationalism and racism, in Israel the Jews proclaim themselves a nation and a race apart. Triumphant Zionism is consolidating everything which modern nationalist and racist anti-Semitism has erected in the past century. It is the greatest error committed by Judaism since the denial of Christ. Henceforth every Jew will be supposed to have a country to which he can be sent back without being able to raise the slightest valid protest. To claim the Holy Land as their real fatherland is even more illogical, since history tells us that hardly one out of ten Jews can claim to be descended from Palestinian Jews, and that from the remotest ages the Promised Land has only sheltered a small fraction of the Jewish population of the world. Had it been a question of a purely spiritual home, Jerusalem could have represented for the faithful what Vatican Rome represents for Catholics.

"The Israeli Government has set itself up as the protector of the Jews of the whole world. It attacked the Czecho-Slovak legation during the Slansky trial. It demonstrated in front of American buildings in favour of the Rosenbergs. . . . It asserts its rights over all Jewish nationals living outside its tiny frontiers without consulting them and in spite of their wishes. It practises a policy of racial discrimination against 150,000 Arabs living in

Israel in a special quarter, contrary to the stipulations of the Balfour Declaration, which laid down that the rights of non-Jewish communities living in Palestine were not in any way to be infringed.

"The Zionist solution does not resolve any of the difficulties of the Jewish problem; it inflicts an enormous injury on Judaism of the dispersion, and is grist to the mill of the anti-Semites.

(Dr. A. Roudinesco, *Le Malheur d'Israel*, pp. 182-5)

"The future of the little Palestinian State is forbidding. Every historian knows that the Holy Land is the most neuralgic spot in the world. It was there that the greatest drama in the history of humanity took place. All the empires fought each other for the sacred places. The Cross and the Crescent have confronted each other there for centuries. The crusaders came and left their bones and only the Venetian traders profited from it. The greatest powers in the world have got their eyes on this strip of land, on which the most important commercial and strategic routes in the world converge, across the most hotly disputed oil-fields.

(Dr. A. Roudinesco, *ibid.*, p. 185)

"The Jewish question is not only confined to the moral order, it is a social and political problem with infinite repercussions. The Dreyfus affair rent and weakened France. Without anti-Semitism, Hitler would not have triumphed in Germany and the Second World War, which cost the lives of sixty million men, could have been avoided.

"Despite every expectation, legal emancipation, assimilation, and Jewish blood poured out on the battle-fields have all proved ineffectual. Anti-Semitism has persisted and become intensified. Israel's destiny remains sealed in misfortune."

(Dr. Roudinesco, *ibid.*, p. 177)

In practice, despite noble professions of democratic faith, assimilation runs into almost unsurmountable difficulties.

Furthermore, the spiritual leaders of World Judaism fiercely oppose each and every different essay at assimilation: national integration, mixed marriage, conversion. . . .

Thus, in his book *Qu'est-ce que le Judaïsme?* Dr. Pasmanik wrote:

"You must choose between life or death. Death is conscious, systematic and deliberate assimilation. But a whole people would never decide to proclaim death as their vital aim. Especially when they know that their national values have preserved their vitality."

(Dr. Pasmanik, *ibid.*, p. 97)

In a recent study on Anti-semitism, Joshua Jehouda is equally categorical:

"Assimilation led to the collective suicide of Israel. It has turned the Jewish people, to use Andre Spire's expression, into 'individuals of dust', unquestionably destined to vanish even without the massive blows of anti-Semitism. If political Zionism, which sprang from the reaction against anti-Semitism, had not awoken the old messianic nostalgia of Israel, emancipated Judaism would have disappeared in anonymity amidst the peoples. Once again the messianism which the Jewish people carries in its breast has saved it from total disaster. Assimilation is the gradual process of detaching the Jews from the spiritual patrimony of Israel. It stems from a false interpretation of the French Revolution, which gave the Jews the dignity of man without abolishing ostracism with regard to the religious doctrine of Judaism."

(Joshua Jehouda: *Antisémitisme*, *Miroir du Monde*, p. 255)

And again:

"The conference of European rabbis held in Great Britain in 1960 passed the following motion: 'We consider it is our solemn duty to warn our communities and every son and daughter of the Jewish people of the terrible evil of mixed marriages which destroy the integrity of the Jewish people and shatter Jewish family life.'"

(Quoted by Rabi in *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, pp. 259-60)

This ban on assimilation extends to every detail of daily life, as we are told by J. Madaule, President of the Amitiés Judéo-Chrétiennes Internationales:

"A Jew may only adopt the clothing and language of the people amongst whom he is spread on condition that he remains a Jew in his heart and does not renounce the mysterious peculiarity which distinguishes him from other men."

(J. Madaule: *Les Juifs et le Monde Actuel*, p. 23)

In March 1964 Dr. Goldmann, President of the World Zionist Organisation, drew the delegates' attention to the dangers of assimilation.

The following article by André Scemama appeared in *Le Monde*:

"Jerusalem, 17th March 1964. On Monday Dr. Nahum Goldmann made his first speech at Jerusalem in his capacity as a citizen of Israel. As a matter of fact, the man who for many years

has presided over the destiny of the world Zionist movement, had just the week before acquired Israeli nationality on landing as an immigrant at Tel-Aviv airport.

"On Monday he opened the first session of the Zionist action committee, the sub-commission of the World Zionist Organisation. Once again he emphasised that the gravest danger which menaced the Jewish people as such today was neither anti-Semitism nor economic discrimination, but the liberalism of our times, which made it possible for Jews to be assimilated into the surroundings in which they lived.

"*'Since we left the ghettos and the mellahs assimilation has become an immense danger,'* Dr. Goldmann declared."

In December 1964 the Twenty-sixth Congress of the World Zionist Organisation took place in Jerusalem. Again Dr. Goldmann warned his audience against the danger of assimilation. The following extracts are taken from André Scemama's report, *Le Monde's* special correspondent:

"Jerusalem, 31st December 1964. The World Zionist Organisation, which gave birth to the State of Israel, is holding its Twenty-sixth Congress in Jerusalem; 540 delegates representing the Zionist federations of thirty-one countries have gathered here.

"... As opposed to two and a half million Jews living in Israel, nearly thirteen million are scattered throughout the world in communities.

"... The strange part about this meeting is that 350 of the 540 delegates are Zionists who have not chosen to live in Israel.

"The real concern of the Zionist leaders is no longer, as formerly, with attracting the Jews of the dispersion to Israel, but with preserving the existence of the Jewish personality, which threatens to vanish in the comfort of an exile which is considered too liberal. In his opening speech, Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Zionist Organisation, spoke of this danger in these terms:

"*'We are living in an age when many of our people, especially our young people, are being threatened by a process of disintegration, not the product of a theory or of a deliberate ideology, but through their daily life and the lack of a faith to keep alive the Jewish conscience and inform each one why he must remain Jewish. If this process is not halted, it will represent a greater threat to perennial Jewish existence than persecution, the inquisition, pogroms and exterminations have been in the past.'*"

(*Le Monde*, 1st January 1965)

8

A STATE WITHIN A STATE

BY their refusal to be converted, and since they cannot really be assimilated, nor want to be, the Jews, taken as a whole, wherever they live as a minority in the heart of nations constitute a State within a State, "a veritable imperium in imperiis", as Wickham Steed described it in *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, (p. 179) even when they enjoy full rights of citizenship:

"It is not just today but since the beginning of their existence that the Jews have been considered as a foreign body, a thorn in the flesh of humanity. In the course of thousands of years it has been as impossible to eliminate them by brutality as it has been to assimilate them by gentleness."

(Memorandum of the Commission Théologique de l'Oeuvre Evangelique suisse, October 1938 quoted by Jules Isaac in *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, p. 29)

"The Diaspora Jews, though dispersed over three continents and in three civilisations, represented but one people, bound by one religion, one language, and one law. They were organised as 'states within states' with the permission of the various Gentile governments of the countries in which they lived."

(M. I. Dimont: *Jews, God and History*, p. 262)

Thus, incapable of taking root, Israel lives among the peoples as a stranger, and the Judaism which it professes separates it from the world by its religion, its nationalism and its traditions:

"*'Thus, by its own nationalism Judaism cuts itself off from the exterior world. It automatically creates its own culture and ethnical ghetto. This is why it is impossible to be both Jewish and the citizen of another nation at the same time. One cannot pray "Next year Jerusalem" and yet remain at London or elsewhere.'*"

(Koestler, quoted by J. Jehouda, in *L'Antisémitisme*, *Miroir du Monde*, p. 268)

We will now give three concrete examples from widely different points in history of the determination of the Jews to live on the fringe of nations.

Let us first open the Bible at the Book of Esther. The scene takes place in the fifth century B.C. At chapter xiii. 4-5 we read the letter sent by King Artaxerxes (Assuerus) to all the governors of the provinces:

(And Aman) "... told me that there was a people scattered through the whole world, which used no laws, and acted against the customs of all nations, despised the commandments of kings, and violated by their opposition the concord of all nations."

In his book *Antisémitisme et Mystère d'Israel*, F. Lovsky quotes the same passage from the Bible of Jerusalem:

"... Aman denounced us as a rebellious people, scattered throughout all the tribes of the world, in opposition with all nations by reason of our laws, and constantly despising royal commands to the extent of becoming an obstacle to the government for which we vouch to the general satisfaction."

And he continues the quotation from the Bible:

"Considering that the said people, unique in its kind, is everywhere in conflict with the whole of humanity, that it differs from the rest of the world by a system of foreign laws, that it is hostile to our interests, and that it commits the worst misdeeds even so far as to menace the stability of our kingdom;

"For these reasons we command that all (Jewish) persons ... shall be radically exterminated ... so that ... absolute stability and tranquillity may henceforth be assured the State."

(Book of Esther xiii. 4-7)

"Lengthy commentary is useless", added Lovsky; "Have we not heard similar talk and read the same explanations less than twenty years ago?"

(ibid., p. 97)

Let us advance 1,000 years to the Merovingian era. St. Avit, Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand, said to the Jews:

"Stay with us and live as we do, or depart as quickly as possible. Return us our land in which you are strangers; free us from contact with you or, if you stay here, share our faith."

(F. Lovsky, ibid., p. 182)

Let us advance a further 1,500 years, to Soviet Russia. The fatherland of Marxist internationalism, in the origin of which members of the Jewish race played such an important role, Soviet Russia cannot tolerate this particular form of nationalism, which in fact camouflages a rival internationalism claiming to escape the Soviet laws:

"The totalitarian State is particularly 'allergic' to every 'international' thought and connection which escapes its control. Thus the Soviet leaders find it is absolutely inadmissible that Jews of the U.S.S.R., whether assimilated or not, feel at one with foreign Jews, and that foreign Jews believe that they have a right to demand explanations from the Soviet Government as to the treatment of their Soviet co-religionists.

"The two prime causes of anti-Jewish policy since Stalin have not been eliminated:

"Firstly, there is always a tendency to consider the Jew as a foreign nationalist in all the Republics which form part of the Soviet Union—while pretending to believe that he has been assimilated.

"And in the second place, an atmosphere of suspicion surrounds Soviet Jews, especially because of their sentimental connections with Israel and with the rest of World Jewry."

(F. Fejtö: *Les Juifs et L'Antisémitisme*, pp. 31, 263)

If we can rely on what Fejtö says, and his remarks are based on various evidence published in the book referred to above, we realise that although the Soviet constitution is not explicitly anti-Semite, in practice the U.S.S.R. applies a statute to the Jews which is coming more and more to resemble the one which used to be enforced by the Christian monarchies in Europe, with this difference, that formerly discrimination was almost entirely religious, whereas today it is both racial, cultural and national: racial by virtue of the word Yevrei (Jew) stamped on the passport and identity card; cultural by virtue of the fact that certain universities are closed to Jews; and national by virtue of the fact that it is difficult for Jews to obtain high positions of responsibility.

Alongside this discrimination, tension is growing in Russia and the satellite countries between the native populations and the Jews, who are considered foreigners.

So far integration has completely failed in the mother-country of Socialism; the Jews refuse to assimilate and did not settle in Biro-bidjan, the province in northern Mongolia offered to them by Lenin. On the other hand Soviet Russia seems unwilling to allow them to emigrate to Israel, which they are more and more coming to accept as their cultural fatherland.

Thus throughout a period of 2,500 years, under different races, different customs, different attitudes and different religions, under the pagan Persians, under Catholicism in the early Middle Ages, and under the totalitarian anti-Christian State of the twentieth century, the Jewish problem has remained and remains to this day identical in form ever since the dispersion of Israel among the nations.

A stranger among the peoples, resisting conversion and assimilation, constituting a State within a State, the Jew untiringly applies himself to judaising the nations.

In his book *Les Juifs et le Monde Actuel*, J. Madaule shows how Luther, at the beginning of the Reformation, at first defended the Jews, but was not long in changing his attitude towards them, for, as he says:

"It was not the Jews who were becoming Protestants but the Protestants who were becoming judaised."

(J. Madaule, *ibid.*, p. 171)

Karl Marx went even further and said:

"The Jew emancipated himself in Jewish fashion, not only by making himself master of the money-market but because owing to him and through him money has become a world power, and the practical Jewish spirit has been adopted by the Christian peoples. *The Jews set themselves free in proportion as the Christians became Jews.*

"Thus they contributed considerably to making money the means, the measure and the end of all human activity."

(Quoted in Salluste:

Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme, p. 285)

Alfred Nossig claims that the Jews have a historic mission to fulfil:

"The Jewish community is more than a people in the modern political meaning of the word. It is the trustee of an historic world mission, I would even say cosmic mission. . . . The conception of our ancestors was to found not a tribe but a world order destined to guide humanity. . . . *Gesta naturae per Judeos*, this is the formula of our history. And the hour of its accomplishment is approaching."

(A. Nossig: *Integrales Judentum*, pp. 1-5)

Elsewhere, Elie Faure has written on this subject:

"Sooner or later they must get the upper hand over and against all men. Later if need be, and in the dark and silence, provided

that the triumph, an insatiable triumph, comes at the end. Later, what does it matter? At the extreme end of time."

(E. Faure: *La Question Juive*, p. 82)

Max I. Dimont concludes his book, *Jews, God and History* in these terms:

". . . two thirds of the civilized world is already governed by the ideas of Jews—the ideas of Moses, Jesus, Paul, Spinoza, Marx, Freud, Einstein."

(*ibid.*, p. 419)

We would only draw the distinction that they themselves have denied, and continue to deny, Christ, and at the same time glorify Marx, Freud and Einstein.

The Jew often retains only the purely temporal aspect of the promises of the Covenant and the Prophets on which, even as an agnostic, he has been brought up, and which encourage him to pursue earthly happiness for immediate enjoyment. This is what the Church has called the "carnal" character of Israel and it is opposed to the spiritual character of Christianity. This quasi exclusive interpretation of the Covenant from the outset drew up the Synagogue against the church.

"The oldest form of Judaism knows nothing of another world. So, weal and woe can come only in this world. If God desires to punish or to reward, He must do so during man's lifetime. The righteous therefore is prosperous here, and the wicked here suffer punishment."

(W. Sombart: *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, pp. 214-15)

"The ideal of Hebrew monotheism is the happiness of men on earth. The Bible never speaks of future life and we know what little value Homer's heroes attached to 'Hades'. Both want to achieve happiness on earth: the former through justice and fraternity, the latter through beauty and liberty. . . ."

(Dr. Pasmanik: *Qu'est-ce que le Judaïsme*, pp. 18-29)

"The beyond does not exist for it," Elie Faure tells us. "Whatever may have been said, Israel has never believed in the beyond, except just at its decline, and except perhaps also in the bosom of esoteric Cabbalism reserved to a few initiates. Did Israel even ever think about it? Everything is natural in the world, including God, who ends in becoming the Spirit. The pact of the Covenant is a bilateral contract, obstinately precise and positive. If the

Jew obeys, the world will be his empire. That is his way of doing things. He lends at heavy interest. Israel is fiercely realistic. It is here below that it wants a reward for those who lead a good life and punishment for those who follow evil ways. None of its great prophets differ on this point. Elias, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel wrathfully call down justice on earth, and if it does not descend it is because man is not worthy of it. It took St. Paul's conjuring-trick to remove it beyond death."

(E. Faure: *La Question Juive*, pp. 83-84)

"The philosophy of the Jew was simple . . . having but a limited number of years allotted to him, he wanted to enjoy them, and he demanded not moral but material pleasures, to embellish and make comfortable his existence. As there was no paradise, he could only expect tangible favours from God in return for his fidelity and piety; not vague promises, good for those seeking the beyond, but actual results, producing an increase of fortune and well-being. . . ."

(B. Lazare: *Anti-Semitism*, pp. 278-9)

Convinced that they are the chosen people destined to possess the whole world as their empire in which to implant their ideal of life, the Jewish people dream of a terrestrial reign in which they will control the social, economic and political life of the nations. And while Christianity dispenses its universal spiritual message to all peoples and at the same time respects their legitimate traditions, culture and customs, Judaism seeks to impose itself as the sole standard and to reduce the world to Jewish values, as has so truly been pointed out by George Batault:

"Essentially unadapted, and to a certain extent unadaptable, to the nation to which in law they belong, the Jews tend fatally and instinctively to reform and transform national institutions in such a way that they become adapted as perfectly as possible to themselves and to the ends which they pursue; ends which are practical at first, but also and above all, messianic. The final, 'imperial' objective, notwithstanding failures and trials always remains the triumph of Israel and its reign over a world subdued and pacified: it is the prophesy of Isaiah interpreted to the letter. . . ."

"They are instinctively sympathetic to everything which tends to disintegrate and dissolve traditional societies, nations and countries.

"The Jews have a feeling and love for Humanity, taken as an aggregate of individuals as abstract and similar to each other as

possible, released from 'the routine' of tradition and liberated from the 'chains' of the past, to be handed over, naked and uprooted, as human material for the undertakings of the great architects of the Future, who will at last construct on principles of Reason and Justice the messianic City over which Israel will reign.

"The power of the Jews is in inverse proportion to the power of the States who receive them, and thus they instinctively work to ruin the power of the State until, in one form or another, they succeed in enslaving and dominating it."

(G. Batault: *Israel contre les Nations*, pp. 107-109 and 75)

Jewish messianism, Batault shows, which claims to be universal in spirit, is in fact only a disguised form of imperialism:

"This form of universalism is absolutely identical with imperialism: the ideal propounded is panisrealism and panjudaism. In this sense, one could argue that pangermanism, for example, which aimed to subject the world, 'for its own real benefit', to the ideals of the Kultur, is also a doctrine with universal tendencies. But the other is, I repeat, purely and simply political, social and religious imperialism."

(G. Batault: *Le Problème juif*, p. 135)

"To be quite sure," Batault continues, "we have only to follow Isidore Loeb's guide to the description of messianic times in Deutero-Isaiah:

" 'The nations will gather to pay homage to the people of God: all the fortunes of the nations will pass to the Jewish people, they will march captive behind the Jewish people in chains and will prostrate themselves before them, their kings will bring up their sons, and their princesses will nurse their children. The Jews will command the nations; they will summon peoples whom they do not even know, and peoples who do not know them will hasten to them. The riches of the sea and the wealth of nations will come to the Jews of their own right. Any people or kingdom who will not serve Israel will be destroyed. . . . ' (Isidore Loeb:

La Littérature des Pauvres dans la Bible, pp. 219-20)

"As for the final result of the messianic revolution, it will always be the same: God will overthrow the nations and the kings and will cause Israel and her King to triumph; the nations will be converted to Judaism and will obey the Law or else they will be destroyed and the Jews will be the masters of the world.

"The Jews' international dream is to unite the world with the

Jewish law, under the direction and domination of the priestly people . . . in a general form of imperialism, which does not prevent Loeb, Darmesteter, Reinach or Lazare and so many others calling this conception universal fraternity."

(G. Batault, *ibid.*, pp. 133-5)

Imbued with a messianic role, they are nevertheless unable to impose their will *openly* on the old Christian nations. They cannot be classed with the knights of medieval chivalry, with the du Guesclins, with St. Louis or St. Francis of Assisi or Richard the Lion Hearted. Yet in certain fields they possess exceptional qualities and powers, as shown in the following remarkable passage:

"His pitiless power of analysis," says Elie Faure, "and his irresistible sarcasm have acted like vitriol.

"From Maimonides to Charlie Chaplin the trail is easy to follow, although the circulation of the Jewish spirit was so to speak ethereal and its power of disintegration was not perceived until after its passage. . . .

"Freud, Einstein, Marcel Proust and Charlie Chaplin have opened in us, in every sense, prodigious avenues which overthrow the dividing-walls in the classical, Greco-Latin, catholic edifice, in the bosom of which the ardent doubt of the Jewish soul has been waiting for five or six centuries for an opportunity to unsettle it. For it is a remarkable fact that it seems to have been his sceptical role which was the first to emerge from the complete silence which enveloped the action of the Jewish spirit in the Middle Ages, a silence which was broken by a few voices as from the Renaissance and which masks such a vast uproar today. Lost in the depths of the masses of Western Christian societies, what could the Jew have done, reduced, moreover, to silence for fifteen centuries, but deny, within the frontiers and the hierarchy imposed by these societies—Christianity for Montaigne, cartesianism for Spinoza, capitalism for Marx, newtonianism for Einstein and if you like, kantism for Freud—waiting until from this very negation there began to appear little by little a new edifice profoundly stamped by an intellect for ever bent on driving away the supernatural from man's horizon and on searching, amid the ruins of morality and immortality, for the materials and means for a new spiritualism? Despite reasons for hope which he accumulated in silence, could the Jew be regarded as anything other than a destroyer armed with the corrosive doubt with which Israel has always opposed the sentimental idealism of Europe since the time of the Greeks? . . .

"In truth, they have brought everything into question again: metaphysics, psychology, physics, biology, the passions. . . .

(E. Faure, *La Question Juive*, p. 90)

"The Jew's historic mission has been clearly defined, perhaps for all time. It will be the principal factor in every apocalyptic epoch, as it was at the end of the ancient world, and as it is now at the end, amid which we are living, of the Christian world. At these moments the Jews will always be in the forefront, both to ruin the old edifice and to mark out the terrain and materials for the new structure which is to replace it. It is this dynamic quality which is the mark of their extraordinary grandeur and perhaps also, it must be admitted, of their visible impotence. . . .

"The Jew destroys every ancient illusion, and if he takes more share than anybody—St. Paul formerly and Karl Marx today, for example—in constructing the new illusion, precisely by reason of his eternal thirst for truth, which always survives the outcomes of political and religious struggles, he is fated to insert in the same illusion the worm which will undermine it. The patriarch who in former times agreed to lead the human conscience across the glowing stretches of knowledge is not ready to lay down his formidable burden."

(E. Faure, *ibid.*, p. 97)

ANTI-SEMITISM

IT may seem paradoxical at first sight that the people who were the first to spread the idea of the one God, whence Christianity proceeds, and who in their history as "the People of God" numbered so many prophets and remarkable men, should have been the object of such general and permanent repulsion, and even hatred, which is known as anti-Semitism.

Throughout the whole history of the confrontation of Judaism and Christianity, the Jews have not failed to place the responsibility for this attitude on Christianity:

"Christian anti-Semitism", as Jules Isaac tells us, "from the fact that it is supported by the Church, bears an official, systematic and coherent character which former pagan anti-Semitism has always lacked. It attends on theology and is nourished by it. . . . It also differs from pagan anti-Semitism, which invariably takes the form of a spontaneous reaction, exceptionally well commanded and organised, in that it pursues a most precise objective—which is to make the Jews hateful—and it owes its success in this achievement to a plan of action which has proved infinitely more harmful than that of pagan anti-Semitism."

(J. Isaac: *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, p. 129)

This is also the opinion of Joshua Jehouda, who writes:

"It is the obstinate Christian claim to be the sole heir to Israel which propagates anti-Semitism. This scandal must terminate sooner or later; the sooner it does, the sooner the world will be rid of the tissue of lies in which anti-Semitism shrouds itself."

(*L'Antisémitisme, Miroir du Monde*, p. 136)

However, for those of us who are endeavouring to understand the Jewish problem in all its complexity throughout the ages, it would be vain to attempt to reduce it to such a view, over-simplified, partial and suggestive of contempt, for all historians, whether Jewish or not, agree that anti-Semitism existed long before Christianity.

Thus Doctor A. Roudinesco writes:

"The hatred of the Jew is very ancient; it appeared before the Christian era, from the very first moment the Israelites made contact with other peoples. Anti-Judaism has flourished in all climates and in every epoch; it is the only historical phenomenon which has resisted the usury of time. The word anti-Semitism is modern and comprises an ethnic idea." (Le Malheur d'Israel, p. 11)

"Anti-Semitism dates back well before Christianity", says the learned French social anthropologist, Vacher de Lapouge; "when one considers that it existed at least fifteen centuries before the present era, it is difficult to see in the agony of Christ the unique cause of the hatred with which they (the Jews) have been pursued by the Christians. . . ."

(*Les Sélections sociales*, cours professé à l'Université de Montpellier, 1888-9, pp. 465-7)

Indeed, many sociologists consider that other causes, inherent in the very character of the Hebrew people themselves, are at the root of the phenomenon of anti-Semitism.

This is demonstrated very clearly by the two Jewish writers, Bernard Lazare and Elie Faure:

"An opinion as general as anti-Semitism, which has flourished in all countries and in all ages, before and after the Christian era, at Alexandria, Rome and Antioch, in Arabia, and in Persia, in medieval and in modern Europe, in a word, in all parts of the world wherever there are or have been Jews—such an opinion, it has seemed to me, could not spring from a mere whim or fancy, but must be the effect of deep and serious causes.

(B. Lazare: *Anti-Semitism*, Preface)

"Wherever the Jews settled after ceasing to be a nation ready to defend its liberty and independence, one observes the development of anti-Semitism, or rather anti-Judaism; for anti-Semitism is an ill-chosen word, which has its *raison d'être* only in our day. . . ."

"If this hostility, this repugnance had been shown towards the Jews at one time or in one country only, it would be easy to account for the local causes of this sentiment. But this race has been the object of hatred with all the nations amidst whom it ever settled. Inasmuch as the enemies of the Jews belong to divers races; as they dwelled far apart from one another, were ruled by different laws and governed by opposite principles; as they had not the same customs and differed in spirit from one another, so that they could not possibly judge alike of any sub-

ject, it must need be that the general causes of anti-Semitism have always resided in Israel itself, and not in those who antagonised it.

(B. Lazare, *ibid.*, pp. 7-8)

"Which virtues or which vices have earned for the Jews this universal enmity? Why was he ill-treated and hated alike and in turn by the Alexandrians and the Romans, by the Persians and the Arabs, by the Turks and the Christian nations? Because everywhere, up to our own days, the Jew was an unsociable being.

"Why was he unsociable? Because he was exclusive, and his exclusiveness was both political and religious, or rather, he held fast to his political and religious cult, to his law."

(B. Lazare, *ibid.*, p. 9)

"Anti-Semitic persecution", writes Elie Faure, "has never abated. It sprang from exterior causes, and not only from the too often quoted theocratic action, the accusation which preceded the Jews everywhere, that they had crucified the God they gave to Europe whom they did not want. They are possessed of an eternal anguish, which alienates them from all the peoples of the earth; they upset their habits, they devastate their well-worn paths, and they dislocate their ancient moral structures. . . .

"Their anguish is expressed in constant dissatisfaction, in stubborn recrimination, in a need to convince which gnaws at them like a prurient and which was only permitted them when they could not lay claim to political domination, and in intellectual restlessness; and thus they are led to criticise everything, to judge everything, to speak ill of everything, which automatically draws upon them the double tyranny of persecution and exile. This did not happen but yesterday. Nor does it date from the time of Christ. They so exasperated the Egyptians that they had to flee *en masse* from Egypt, and the Persians were so tired of them that they encouraged them to return home. The Romans, who were not interested in moral problems and whose firm tolerance kept religious peace everywhere, slit their throats and drowned their furious protests and passionate anathemas in blood. Pilate delivered Christ up to them in order to rid himself of them.

"Let it be said: they have annoyed the whole world. But therein perhaps lies their greatness. They refused silence and the slough of torpor. Everywhere they have with invincible obstinacy denied their surroundings, whether, dragged from captivity to captivity or sent away into exile after exile, they were forced into them or adopted them of their own free will. And this obstinacy will not I imagine die out before the last of them is gone. . . .

"It is not surprising then that from the earliest times until today, the Jew has awoken almost everywhere a frank or veiled hostility which has been expressed in almost every degree from purely speculative anti-Semitism to the most atrocious massacres. . . ."

(E. Faure: *La Question juive*)

Renan, who can hardly be described as a man with a "Christian complex", or mentally unwell in terms of modern psychiatry, as apparently is the case, according to Joshua Jéhouda, with all who do not admire the Jewish people, (*L'Antisémitisme, Miroir du Monde*, pp. 72-73), is no less explicit on this point:

"Hatred of the Jews was, moreover, so generally diffused a feeling in the ancient world that there was no need to spur it. This hatred marks one of the trenches of separation which, perhaps, will never be filled up in the human species. It is due to something more than race. It cannot be without reason that poor Israel has spent its life as a people in being massacred. When all nations and all ages have persecuted you, there must be some motive behind it all.

"The Jew, up to our own time, insinuated himself everywhere, claiming the protection of the common law; but, in reality, remaining outside the common law. He retained his own status; he wished to have the same guarantees as everyone else, and, over and above that, his own exceptions and special laws. He desired the advantages of the nations without being a nation, without helping to bear the burdens of the nations. No people has ever been able to tolerate this. The nations are military creations founded and maintained by the sword; they are the work of peasants and soldiers; towards establishing them the Jews have contributed nothing. Herein is the great fallacy inspired in Israelite pretensions. The tolerated alien can be useful to a country, but only on condition that the country does not allow itself to be invaded by him. It is not fair to claim family rights in a house which one has not built, like those birds which come and take up their quarters in a nest which does not belong to them, or like the crustaceans which steal the shell of another species."

(E. Renan: *The Antichrist*, pp. 126-7)

Anti-Semitism—and it should be noted that the term "anti-Semitism" is, properly speaking, incorrect in itself, since many Semite peoples, such as the Arabs or Egyptians, are or have been "anti-Semitic" in the customary use of the word—anti-Semitism, as we

have shown, has existed for more than 3,000 years under many different forms:

1. There was anti-Semitism in Egypt, as the Bible relates;
2. There was anti-Semitism in Persia, as described in the Book of Esther;
3. There was anti-Semitism in Greece;
4. There was anti-Semitism in Alexandria, with the celebrated controversialist Appio at its head;
5. There was anti-Semitism at Rome, which numbered among its ranks some of the Eternal City's most famous sons: Cicero, Tacitus, Seneca, Juvenal and others.

"How glorious for anti-Semitism to be able to inscribe on its honours list the names of Seneca, Juvenal and Tacitus . . ." writes Jules Isaac in his *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*. "Tacitus is unquestionably the most noble flower of all time in the crown of anti-Semitism."

(ibid., pp. 114-15)

There was thus a general form of pagan anti-Semitism.

Religious anti-Semitism has been equally diverse. The world has seen:

1. Zoroastrian anti-Semitism;
2. Gnostic and Manichean anti-Semitism;
3. Orthodox anti-Semitism;
4. Moslem anti-Semitism;
5. Protestant anti-Semitism.

Of the latter form, nobody, perhaps, has used more violent language than Luther.

But among the Protestants, the most redoubtable adversary the Synagogue has ever had to face was, according to Massoutié, John Andrew Eisenmenger (1654-1704), professor of oriental languages at the University of Heidelberg. For it is from Eisenmenger's book, *Judaism Unmasked*, that

"Anti-Semites in Germany and other countries in turn have to this very day obtained most of their arms against the Synagogue. . . .

"Eisenmenger is bent on showing above all in his work at how many points Judaism and Christianity differ, two religions which originally only differed from one another in the lightest shades of meaning."

(L. Massoutié: *Judaïsme et Hitlerisme*, pp. 138-9, 141)

But what is perhaps even more extraordinary is the fact of the phenomenon of political and philosophical anti-Semitism. The pages of history bear witness to:

1. Rationalist anti-Semitism, led by Voltaire;
2. Socialist anti-Semitism, under Toussenel;
3. Racial anti-Semitism under Hitler;
4. Nationalist and patriotic anti-Semitism in almost every country, and;
5. Economic anti-Semitism, which is similarly universal.

Finally today, most incredible of all, we are confronted with

1. Soviet anti-Semitism.

In short, every country and every epoch has in turn known anti-Semitism in one form or another, sometimes smouldering under the surface, sometimes prescribed by law, sometimes erupting in furious and bloody explosions.

And in the course of 3,000 years all possible and imaginable solutions have been tried in an endeavour to solve the Jewish problem:

1. Peaceful coexistence;
2. Conversion;
3. Segregation and the Ghetto;
4. Expulsion;
5. Pogroms;
6. Political emancipation;
7. Assimilation;
8. Mixed marriages;
9. The numerus clausus;
10. The spur and the yellow star;

and finally, the most recent solutions that have been attempted are:

11. Racism;
12. Marxism.

All these solutions have in the end proved inoperative. Doctor Roudinesco records that:

"Anti-Semitism appeared from the first moment when the Jews came into contact with the rest of the world; it has endured throughout the centuries to our own day. It has resisted political revolutions, social transformation and mental evolution. It is as active today as it has been in the past; it has assumed very varied forms according to the specific illusion of each epoch; it has often changed its name but its character has remained the

same. There is no reason to hope that it will disappear. If one measures its power by the number of its victims, one is obliged to recognise that it has become more intense. The carnage of Alexandria, the massacres of the Middle Ages, the Russian and Polish pogroms are insignificant compared with the recent exterminations under Hitler. . . .

"The Jewish question is not only confined to the moral order, it is a social and political problem with infinite repercussions. The Dreyfus affair rent and weakened France. Without anti-Semitism, Hitler would not have triumphed in Germany and the Second World War, which cost the lives of sixty million men, could have been avoided.

"Despite every expectation, legal emancipation, assimilation, and Jewish blood poured out on the battle-fields have all proved ineffectual. Anti-Semitism has persisted and become intensified. Israel's destiny remains sealed in misfortune."

(Dr. A. Roudinesco: *Le Malheur d'Israel*, pp. 173, 177)

The Jewish people tend to think of themselves as the innocent victims of the hatred of the world, but most of the defensive measures against them in the West—regarded by them as manifestations of prejudice, intolerance, hatred and anti-Semitism—have been borrowed from Jewish legislation and turned against its authors.

Religious intolerance was unknown in pagan society:

"Each people had its own particular gods and recognised the legitimate sovereignty of foreign deities over other countries."
(E. Benamozegh: *Israel et l'Humanité*, p. 21)

The Jews alone in antiquity professed uncompromising religious exclusiveness, as G. Batault explains in detail in the following passage:

"A certain apologetic school of history has for too long insisted on the idea that the pagans held the monopoly of intolerance and religious persecution. Nothing could be more false, and modern scholarship and impartial history prove that this assertion is more than fully justified. Intolerance, proceeding directly from the religious exclusiveness of the Israelites, is a purely Jewish invention, which was inherited by Christianity and so transmitted to the modern world.

"However the chosen people carried with it something which was to have an amazing destiny in the future in the heart of the western world, a strong and rigorous conception of the divinity, and a proud unshakeable and fanatical faith in an all-powerful,

authoritarian, exclusive and jealous God, and in the height of virtuousness of a minutely-detailed, captious law.

"While the Alexandrine civilisation, the heir of both the Greek and all the Mediterranean civilisations, meted out to the world, under the aegis of the military and political genius of Alexander, the arts, the sciences, and the highest philosophical speculations, the Jews, who were beginning to spread over this immense sort of 'internation' which the hellenic world formed, presented it with jealous monotheism, exclusive ritualism and religious intolerance; ideas which were unknown until then, though their significance and influence were later to be unequalled. . . .

"Judaism was not only an exclusive belief which contradicted the pagans' profound convictions and feelings of tolerance, it was also an exclusive and tyrannical law which contradicted their habits, their customs, their manners and particularly their noble and touching sense of hospitality. . . . Jewish exclusiveness made itself felt in the everyday commerce of daily life in a thousand and one little ways, by their refusal to eat with the pagans, or take part in their games and exercises, or serve under their standards, by their judicial autonomy and their separate marriages. Wherever rather numerous Jewish colonies became established, whether voluntarily or not, in the midst of Greek or hellenic peoples, the Jews inevitably adopted and kept a foreign appearance. In spite of the fact that they could talk and write Greek, and organise their life in the Greek fashion, their tight solidarity and their social and legal isolation, which by its malignancy exaggerated its significance and the consequences, placed them in opposition to life under the Greeks and the Romans, so that they were like strangers, 'more distant from us', said Philostrates, 'than Susa, Bactria or India'.

"To the minds of the ancients, so open, so comprehensive and so tolerant, Jewish exclusiveness was a monstrosity: intolerance, a Jewish invention and virtue, was completely incomprehensible to them. In the hellenistic period they were perfectly able to conceive of one God, worshipped everywhere under different names, and possessing different attributes, but they were quite unable to understand that this one God should be precisely and exclusively the God of the Jews. . . .

"Contrary to what one is too often led to believe, the Jews did not introduce to the world an international and universal or metaphysical conception of monotheism, which was derived quite normally from the political state of the time and from the speculations of Greek philosophy; but they did introduce the idea of the exclusive monotheism of Jahve, the jealous and tyrannical God.

"By a singularly ironical stroke of Fate, when upon two occasions, first with Christianity and later with Islam, the exclusive and jealous God of the Jews, with his inseparable companions intolerance and fanaticism, triumphed, he turned against the chosen people and added to their troubles."

(G. Batault: *Le Problème Juif*, pp. 60, 63, 64, 65, 85)

The intolerance which the Jews bitterly accuse Christianity of practising against them takes its roots, as we shall see, from essentially Judaic concepts:

"We can now see how the forces shaping Jewish history in the early Feudal Age began with two paradoxes. Not only were the Jews the only non-Christians left in the entire Christian world, but, ironically, they lived in freedom outside the feudal system, while the Gentiles were imprisoned within it.

"Why had the Jews not been converted or killed as had the other pagans and non-believers? Why had they received special exemption? Why did the Church protect them?"

"The Church had manoeuvred itself into this paradoxical impasse by the force of its own logic. Because the civilisation of the Middle Ages was religiously oriented, it was important that the Jews be converted to Christianity. . . .

"At first every conciliation was held out to the Jews as an inducement to accept Christianity. The Jews would not convert. . . . The Jew was an ambivalent figure in the Western world. He could neither be converted nor killed. . . . The Jew therefore was excluded from the feudal system. . . .

"Some of the laws enacted against the Jews in these centuries were not new. They were, in fact, patterned after Old Testament and Talmudic laws against non-Jews. Old Jewish laws forbade a non-Jew being appointed king of Israel, or holding a post from which he could govern Jews. To prevent too great an intermixing between Jews and Greeks, Palestinian law forbade a Jew to sell land to a non-Jew. The Christians enacted like laws against the Jews. These cannot be judged as good or bad in terms of today's society. They were an expression of society in those days."

(M. I. Dimont: *Jews, God and History*, pp. 218-19)

Let us take as a particular instance, the Inquisition, set up in the thirteenth century to put an end to the Albigensian heresy.

After the crusade against the Albigensians, which numbered a great many victims:

"The Papacy became alarmed at all this bloodshed, forbade the private hunting of heretics (as it was later to forbid the local

hunting of Jews), and instituted the Inquisition (from the Latin *inquisitio*, meaning an 'inquiry') in order to determine whether an accused actually was a heretic. During the first centuries of its existence, the Inquisition had no power to deal with Jews, Mohammedans, or any other non-believers, only with Christians.

"As the Church abhorred the shedding of blood, it was decided that those convicted should be burned. Ironically, modern man looks with horror upon burning someone for his religious beliefs, yet sees nothing incongruous in shooting or hanging a man for his political convictions. Also, ironically, the authority for killing a heretic stems from the Old Testament itself, from Deuteronomy xvii. 2-5: 'If there be found in the midst of thee . . . man or woman, that does that which is evil in the sight of the Lord thy God in transgressing His covenant, and has gone and served other gods, and worshipped them . . . and it be told thee . . . then shalt thou bring forth that man or woman . . . thou shalt stone them with stones that they die.' Because only Christians could commit heresy in the eyes of the Church, this Mosaic law, with an updated punishment, was applied only to them. And thus came about the twist of fate which brought Jews comparative safety from the Inquisition while Christians burned one another at the stake."

(M. I. Dimont, *ibid.*, pp. 224-5)

Doctor Roudinesco too agrees that the burden of intolerance must be divided among the Jews and the Christians:

"They were monsters, these men who burnt other men alive who were not of their faith. The sole ground for complaint against the Jews at this time was of a religious order. But the theological anti-Judaism of the Middle Ages is easy to understand. Religious tolerance did not exist. The Jews were as intolerant as the Christians. The former persecuted their heretics just as the Christians persecuted theirs. The Synagogue excommunicated as rigorously as the Church." (Dr. A. Roudinesco: *Le Malheur d'Israel*, p. 40)

Again, it was the Synagogue which was the first to impose on Jews the duty of wearing a distinctive badge; and yet among the different measures which the Church has taken against the Jews to thwart their policy of infiltration and corruption, there is one against which they have always violently protested, considering it particularly defamatory, namely, the obligation to wear a distinctive badge, such as a spur, a hat or a star.

This measure, which was imposed by the 4th Lateran Council in 1215, and renewed by the bulls of Honorius III (1221), Martin V

(1425), Paul IV (1555), St. Pius V (1566) and Clement VIII (1593), was only reviving an old Jewish custom, which laid down that the Jews should distinguish themselves from other peoples by their dress. This was emphasised by Clement III when he made known the decision of the Council to the faithful:

"All that we have to do," he said, "is to bring the Jews back again to the observation of the laws of Moses commanding them to wear distinctive dress."

St. Thomas Aquinas, writing to the Duchess of Brabant, makes the same comment on the decision:

"It is what they are commanded in their own law, that is to say, to wear fringes on the four corners of their cloaks so that they may be distinguished from other peoples."

(Quoted by Lovsky in
Antisémitisme et Mystère d'Israel, p. 199)

Let us finally deal with the question of race.

The Jews protested vehemently against Hitler's racial régime; and yet they were the first people in history to exalt the idea of race, thinking of themselves as belonging to the "chosen race". In other words, they created a concept of race which other peoples, having long ignored, have borrowed from them, at times even to turn it against them.

It is opportune to remark here that the Jews are the only ethnic group who are naturally and fundamentally race conscious, since their ideas of race and religion are inextricably entwined. "The Semitic religions", wrote Kadmi-Cohen in *Nomades*, "are only the spiritualised deification of the race."

Thus it is not without a certain irony that we are now witnessing a flood of rage against a policy which in Germany revived the idea of race, turning it against its inventors.

In the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, E. Dhorme wrote in 1934:

"Judaism has made a powerful contribution in implanting in the world this concept of race, or more specifically of the seed . . . which should be traced back to great ancestors and endure without mixture throughout the ages. The persecutions which the Jews have suffered in Christian countries are due, in part, to the fusion of race and religion which marked out the children of Israel as a special category of unassimilable citizens. Racism is a dangerous theory, but let us recognise that it was upheld by the Semites long before it was by the Aryans."

(Quoted by Lovsky, *ibid.*, p. 364)

All Jewish writers exalt the indestructibility and superiority of their race, which they regard as destined to exert a great influence on all others. Disraeli, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, wrote:

"Every generation they must become more powerful and more dangerous to the society which is hostile to them. Do you think that the quiet humdrum persecution of a decorous representative of an English university can crush those who have successfully baffled the Pharaohs, Nebuchadnezzar, Rome, and the Feudal ages? . . . No penal laws, no physical tortures can effect that a superior race should be absorbed in an inferior, or be destroyed by it. The mixed persecuting races disappear; the pure persecuted race remains. And at this moment, in spite of centuries, of tens of centuries, of degradation, the Jewish mind exercises a vast influence on the affairs of Europe."

(Disraeli: *Coningsby*, pp. 226-7)

In *Notre Jeunesse*, Charles Péguy draws a very characteristic portrait of his friend Bernard Lazare, in which the word "race" recurs as the central theme, pregnant with meaning. We have taken the following extract from it:

"There was never a moment when every muscle and every nerve was not strained to answer his secret mission. Never was a man more conscious of his role as the leader of his race and of his people, nor more responsible for them; a man perpetually taunted by an unattonable reverse and sub-tension. Not a sentiment, not a thought, not the shadow of a passion, but was not strained and governed by a commandment fifty centuries old; a whole race, a whole world he carried on his bowed shoulders, a race, a world of fifty centuries on round, heavy shoulders; and his heart was consumed with fire, with the fire of his race and of his people; his heart was on fire, his mind was passionate, and from his prophetic lips came forth live coals!"

(C. Péguy:

Notre Jeunesse dans Oeuvres en prose 1909-14, p. 560)

In 1936 the Jewish author Kadmi-Cohen wrote a book called *Nomades* to glorify and indeed to deify his race which, according to him, has succeeded in preserving its unity and purity throughout its nomadic life. The extracts below have been taken from his work:

One cannot ignore the

"Extraordinary and absurd persistence of the Semite race and, within the race, the persistence of physical types. Sometimes one

notices a striking resemblance in the cast of features between a Jew who has been completely westernised and the Arab Bedouin, from whom he is separated by a stretch of some 3,000 years.

"Besides, the perpetuity of certain manners is significant. Centuries of living amidst Slav and Nordic peoples have not lost the Jew his frenzy, his need to gesticulate nor his immoderate love of the highly-seasoned cooking of the Mediterranean.

"Examples of this stability, which is so surprising that one is compelled to call it survival, are so numerous that they embody the whole of Arab and Jewish life.

"There is in the destiny of the race, as in the Semitic character, a fixity, a stability and an immortality which are most striking. . . .

"I am what I am, says the Eternal. The Eternal, it is the race.

"One in its substance, not differentiated. One in time—stable—eternal."

(Kadmi-Cohen: *Nomades*, p. 14)

"The unity of the Semitic concept is primarily and absolutely explained by the nomadic character of the Semites' way of life. A race of nomads, they were shepherds who roamed from pasture to pasture rather than farmers who tilled the land. They have remained nomads. The imprint is as indelible as a mark cut on the trunk of a tree, for as the trunk grows and expands the mark becomes protracted and disfigured, but it remains none the less distinguishable.

(Kadmi-Cohen, *ibid.*, pp. 115-16)

"Let it be fully recognised; the nomadic state, with the Semite, as opposed to the history of other peoples, has never partaken of a transitory character or of a stage in the preparation for a sedentary life. It takes its source from the depth of the Semite heart.

(Kadmi-Cohen, *ibid.*, p. 19)

"That the nomadic life may by itself be a factor in the preservation of the race and of its ethnic purity is conceivable. A tribe which wanders thereby accepts isolation, and in spite of and even because of its migrations, it remains identical and true to itself.

(Kadmi-Cohen, *ibid.*, p. 25)

"So the blood which runs in its veins has preserved its purity first and foremost, and the succession of the centuries will only serve to strengthen the value of the race.

"The Semites and particularly the Jews provide natural and historical proof of this phenomenon. Nowhere has the respect for the blood been proscribed with equal intransigence. . . .

"The history of this people such as it is recorded in the Bible, constantly insists on the danger of mixing with foreigners . . . and in our days, just as thirty centuries ago, the vitality of this racial characteristic is maintained and can be seen by the infrequency of mixed marriages between Jews and non-Jews.

"Thus it is round this exclusive love and jealousy, one could say, of race, that the profound meaning of Semitism and of its ideal character is centred. The People constitutes an autonomous and autogenous entity, dependent on no country, not accepting the laws in force in the country where it resides, and energetically refusing the introduction of cross-breeding, fruitful though it may be. Without material or external support, it cultivates solely its own unity. . . .

"... and it is . . . this formidable value, which is thus conferred on the race, which alone explains this unique phenomenon, absolutely without exception, that of all the innumerable peoples, one alone, the Jewish people, has survived on its own and remained from time immemorial, in spite of everything."

(Kadmi-Cohen, *ibid.*, pp. 26-28)

Practising an exclusive form of racial apartheid themselves, the Jews are equally uncompromising opponents of race when it is a question of rival ideologies of the German or other kinds. They urged fanatically for war against Hitler. In scarcely veiled terms, Leon Blum invited the democracies to destroy racial ideology in an article which appeared in *Paris-Soir* on 23rd March 1939:

"The re-organisation, the reconciliation and the co-operation of all the States in the world that are attached to liberty and peace, and the stimulation and exaltation of the democratic system, and at the same time the systematic destruction of the racist ideology, that is the essential task incumbent on the great movements of public opinion, without which the governments would be impotent."

SIX million dead, such is the fearful figure with which the organisations of Jewry ceaselessly confront the world; it is the unanswered argument of which they availed themselves at the Council in order to obtain a revision of the Catholic Liturgy.

Le Monde of the 3rd January 1965 recently published an article à propos of this subject by Vladimir Jankélévitch, from which we have taken the following passage:

"This crime without name is a crime that is truly infinite, and the further it is analysed the further its inexpressible horror deepens. We ourselves, who should have so many reasons to know, are daily learning something new, some particularly revolting detail, some torture of special ingenuity, some Machiavellian atrocity of which one is compelled to say that only Germanic sadism could be guilty. It is not surprising that a fathomless crime should produce some sort of meditation that knows no exhaustion. The unheard of inventions of cruelty, the depths of the most diabolical perversity, the unimaginable refinements of hatred, all this leaves us dumb and at first baffles the mind. One will never plumb the depths of the mystery of this gratuitous wickedness.

"Correctly speaking, this grandiose massacre is not a crime on the human scale any more than are the splendours of astronomy and the light years. . . .

"Before infinity all finite dimensions tend to become equal, with the result that the punishment becomes almost a matter of indifference; what has happened is literally unatonable. We don't even know whom to blame or whom to accuse. . . .

"The methodical, scientific and administrative massacre of six million Jews is not a wrong *per se*, it is a crime for which a whole people is accountable. . . .

"What happened is unique in history and without doubt will never happen again, for nothing like it has been seen since the

world began; the day will come when we will no longer even be able to explain it."

As one can see from the above, the Jews furiously repudiate the very idea of collective responsibility as far as they are concerned, but do not hesitate to hold the German people collectively responsible for the wrongs done to Israel under the Hitler régime.

However, it now appears that we cannot accept this figure of six million. A French writer, Paul Rassinier, has made a very penetrating study of this subject, which he has brought together in four large volumes, entitled: *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse*, *Ulysse trahi par les siens*, *Le Vritable Procès Eichmann ou les Vainqueurs incorrigibles* and *Le Drame des Juifs Européens*.

Rassinier is a left-wing Socialist and an agnostic, who was himself deported to Buchenwald; he cannot therefore be suspected of being sympathetic to National Socialism. In Appendix II we give a résumé of these works, and of the author's conclusions.

Since the last war, the whole world has been inundated with a torrent of literature, for the most part unreasoning, and at the same time violently and axiomatically hostile to Germany under Hitler, in which all desire calmly and honestly to seek out the truth and face it, however unpleasant it may be, however unlike what it is pre-conceived to be, appears to have been thrown to the wind. "The first law of history", wrote the great Pontiff, Leo XIII, "is not to say what is false; next, not to fear to say what is true." It is appropriate therefore, at this stage, to recall a few sober facts about the last war, which are not as well known or remembered as others.

Firstly, Hitler's Germany did not only attack the Jews; if we count all the losses suffered during the war, more non-Jewish deportees and prisoners of war and others died than Jews.

At the outbreak of war there were about 300,000 French Jews and 170,000 foreign Jews in France. Rather less than 100,000 were deported, of whom the majority were foreign Jews. We recognise that this is a very great number but we are far away from the legendary six million figure.

On the other hand, at the Liberation about 105,000 Frenchmen were assassinated by other Frenchmen in the name of the Resistance; 95 per cent of these were good men whose only fault was that they were anti-Communist and not pro-Gaullist. No one seems to care about this. The universal conscience is only interested in Jewish victims.

Paul Serant has described the purges which took place in France and other European countries after the liberation, and which in France went on for years:

"As soon as the commissions began to bring out of prison those

who could not be reproached with anything, people began to demand that the purge be maintained.

"They were not all Communists. It was in a paper of a mainly conservative readership, *l'Ordre*, that Mr. Julian Benda demanded the most harsh enforcement of a purge against those who were beginning to talk of clemency. The government, in his opinion, must agree to be the government of a party, the patriotic party. It doesn't matter if all Frenchmen are not represented since those who are not patriots ought not to count. Here is a good reason to refuse them appeasement: 'It is perfectly false to maintain that reconciliation of the type you preach is vital for a nation. The Russian government is a one-party government of patriots and it pitilessly exterminated that class of citizens which thirty years ago, itself hoped and worked for the victory of the enemy. One cannot exactly say that the Russian nation is no longer in existence as a result. . . .' One could hardly put it more briefly or more precisely."

(Paul Serant: *Les Vaincus de la Libération*, p. 234)

The Allies themselves have heavy responsibilities to bear.

Take, for example, the handing over to the Soviets of the whole of Wlassow's army by the Anglo-American authorities. In their zone the Americans were perfectly free to do what they liked and they must have known that they were handing these men over to certain death.

At the outset of the invasion of Russia by the German army in 1941, many thousands of Russian officers and soldiers deserted and threw in their lot with the Germans in order to fight with them against the tyranny of Stalin. One of them, General Wlassow, former Commander of the 2nd Soviet Army, a national hero of the U.S.S.R. and very popular in the army, was put in command by German officers of various Russian units which had been formed to fight to liberate their country from the Soviet yoke.

A first Wlassow army, a crack unit 40,000 strong, commanded by Colonel Boudnitchenko, occupied Prague, replacing the German SS units. At the approach of the Russian troops, this division withdrew towards the American army which had entered Czechoslovakia and which compelled them to hand over their arms. When the American troops retreated the division found they were surrounded by the Soviets. Many committed suicide and the rest were taken prisoner; the officers were shot and the non-commissioned officers and soldiers were sent away to concentration camps. But beforehand many were used by Beria for propaganda purposes. Manacled, they were piled into lorries with posters on them which read: "This

is the fate which Americans reserve for those who put their trust in them", and paraded in front of unit after unit. Few of them survived.

A second Wlassow division, commanded by General Meandrov, was interned by the Americans at Plattling in Bavaria; in February and March 1946 they were handed over to the Soviets in the most disgraceful fashion. Awoken at dawn, the men were penned up like animals, herded to the station and crammed into trucks to the blows of rifle butts, while jazz music blared to stifle their cries. Many committed suicide, and a few succeeded in escaping.

The cavalry units under Wlassow formed an autonomous corps and were in Italy at the time of the German collapse. Moving up to Bavaria to rejoin Wlassow, they were halted at Linz by the British authorities, who invited the Cossack leaders to dine with them. Among them were General Prince Bekovitch Tcherkassy, General Krasnov, his nephew Colonel Semione Krasnov and others. When they arrived in full evening-dress they were arrested by the British, who took them to Berlin and handed them over to the Soviets. They were all hanged.

General Wlassow himself was captured by a Soviet unit and hanged at Moscow.

The Americans also handed over to the Soviets General Troukhine, Wlassow's deputy-in-chief, General Malychkine, his Chief of Staff, and several other high-ranking officers.

Two of Wlassow's envoys, who had been sent to negotiate the internment of his troops in Western Germany, for which they had obtained safe-conducts from the Americans, were nevertheless arrested on their arrival and held prisoner. Captain Lapine refused to commit suicide and was handed over to the Soviets. Captain Bykadorov was released.

The Americans continued handing over the remains of Wlassow's units little by little until June 1947. At that date an important Wlassow detachment was put on board ship for Russia, not without having first fought a veritable battle with the Americans.

No forcible repatriations took place in the French zone of occupation. But under the first Gaullist government, the Soviet State Security was authorised to set up a camp at Beauregard, whence former Soviet citizens interned in the camp were forcibly repatriated to the U.S.S.R. Furthermore, this body was given a free hand to operate in broad daylight in Paris itself, happily only for a short period; on several occasions its agents entered the flats of former émigrés and took away former Soviet subjects who did not want to be repatriated and had taken refuge there. Between March and April 1946, Lieutenant Laptchinski, a young Russian, was removed from

the flat of Count Ivan Tolstoy, the grandson of the great writer, who had been sheltering him.

In 1947 the Beauregard camp was closed.

And after the death of Stalin the survivors of Wlassow's army were released from the concentration camps.

Let us now turn to Soviet Russia.

The number of the victims of Marxist terrorism reaches apocalyptic proportions. In Russia and in the satellite countries as well, there have been millions of deaths of every category; by assassination, by famine, by shooting in street-fighting and massacres by the Tcheka . . . and tens of millions of people have been deported. Up to quite recently, it has been estimated that the camps of political deportees, particularly those in the far North of Siberia, had held sometimes as many as fifteen million prisoners, many of whom had died of misery, exhaustion and illness. It is enough to recall the massive and pitiless deportation of the Russian Koulac peasants who were hostile to collectivisation :

" . . . according to Margaret Buber-Neuman, Navareno Scarioli, the Italian Communist who fled to Moscow in 1925 and experienced the Russian concentration camps between 1937 and 1954, painted a picture in the Rome magazine *Vita* on the 23rd November 1961 which surpasses in horror anything which could have been written by survivors of the German camps, even the most incredible stories."

(Rassinier: *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann*, pp. 9-10)

Under the heading "A Yugoslav review says that the U.S.S.R. committed the crime of genocide before Hitler", *Le Monde* of the 7th February 1965, analyses an account by Mr. Mihajlov, an undergraduate of the University of Zadar, Dalmatia, of a trip he made the summer before to the Soviet Union, published in the literary review, *Delo*, from which the following extract is taken :

" . . . this piece of writing is going to cause trouble. It consists of a series of reflections and notes on the concentration camps in the Soviet Union in which, up to 1956-57, between eight and twelve million people were interned. . . .

"The great majority of those who have been rehabilitated and who had the luck to survive, do not want to keep silence any more, writes Mr. Mihajlov. . . .

"Another passage . . . deals with the 'death camps'. It is symptomatic, writes Mr. Mihajlov, that the Soviet Press makes less and less mention of Nazi camps and avoids comparing them with her

own. The first death camp was not organised by the Germans but by the Soviets; it came into operation in 1921 at Holmogor near Archangel. It worked 'successfully' for years.

"Recalling the terror in the first years after the revolution and the execution without trial in Crimea, 1920-1, of 120,000 prisoners, Mr. Mihajlov states that a certain Vera Grebnjakov, known under the alias of Dora, is still remembered there. She did her 'work' at Odessa and with her own hand is said to have killed and tortured 700 prisoners.

"Hitler was not the first to commit the crime of genocide, says the writer. On the eve of the Second World War, the peoples along the frontiers of Turkey and Iraq were deported to northernmost Siberia where, being unaccustomed to the cold, they died like flies."

(*Le Monde*, 7th February 1965, front page)

In the last war, one and a half million people from Poland and the Ukraine were deported by the Soviet Union :

"Interrogated at Nuremberg on 21st March 1946, by General Rudenko, the Russian prosecutor, Field-Marshal Goering replied that 'one million people from Poland and the Ukraine were deported from territories occupied by the Soviet Union and taken to the East and Far-East' (*C.R. des débats*, vol. IX, p. 673) but he was not allowed to quote references or to proceed further. The first Polish government of London has however published a document according to which the number of Poles deported was between 1,000,000 and 1,600,000 of whom 400,000 died on the journey; among the dead were 77,834 out of 144,000 children according to information provided by the American Red Cross . . . the Russians extended the process to the Baltic States, whence they deported 60,940 Estonians, 60,000 Latvians and 70,000 Lithuanians. . . ."

(Rassinier, *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann*, p. 44)

A further 12,000 officers of the 1939 Polish army were massacred to a man by the Russians; 4,000 of their corpses were identified in the Katyn Forest graves.

Of the 100,000 German prisoners captured at Stalingrad only 5,000 came back alive, the others died in the camps.

Between 1st July 1945 and 1st January 1947, approximately 7,300,000 people were sent back from Silesia to Germany by the Russians, according to Rassinier (*ibid.*, p. 107). Jammed into cattle-trucks, they were left without food on a journey of four to five days. In the *Revue des Deux Mondes* on 15th May 1952, Mr. Jean de

Pange stated that more than four million of these unfortunate people died.

Hideous scenes of massacre and violence accompanied the capture of Berlin and the invasion of Germany by the Soviet armies, for on the Eastern Front it was a veritable war of extermination, conducted on both sides with atrocious savagery.

Finally, one must not forget the bloody repression of the popular uprising in Hungary in 1956.

Until the death of Stalin, terror has always been an essential part of the Soviet régime, and in the realm of revolutionary terrorism, and the development of Marxism as a revolutionary doctrine, the names of outstanding Jewish leaders readily come to mind: Karl Marx, Lassalle, Kautsky, Liebnicht, Rosa Luxembourg, and others. It is a modern form of messianism, always read to overthrow everything. On the subject of Marx, this is what Bernard Lazare has to say in his celebrated work, *Anti-Semitism*:

"The descendant of a long line of rabbis and teachers, he inherited the splendid powers of his ancestors. He had that clear Talmudic mind which does not falter at the petty difficulties of fact. He was a Talmudist devoted to sociology and applying his native power of exegesis to the criticism of economic theory. He was inspired by that ancient Hebraic materialism which, rejecting as too distant and doubtful the hope of an Eden after death, never ceased to dream of Paradise realised on earth. But Marx was not a mere logician, he was also a rebel, an agitator, an acrid controversialist, and he derived his gift for sarcasm and invective, as Heine did, from his Jewish ancestry." (pp. 315-16)

On the other hand, this is what Rabi says in his *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*:

"There is always a chosen people in the Marxist vision but henceforward it is the proletariat. There will be catastrophes, such as the prophets have foretold, but these are the normal results of the inevitable class struggle. There is also a finality in the historical process, its destiny is sealed, victory is inexorable, the proletariat lives and struggles in the path of history, and history, if not God, is on the side of the proletariat. With Marx, socialism became a secular version of Jewish messianism. The idea was born in Palestine and has now taken root in Moscow and Peking."

(p. 250)

The following passage is taken from the revolutionary Jewish writer, A. Rosenberg, who was a leader of the German Communist

Party between 1917 and 1927. It is of capital importance since it clearly reveals the essentially revolutionary and destructive nature of Marxism, camouflaged behind the slogan of the liberation of the proletariat.

"It was not an overwhelming consciousness of the necessity for freeing the proletariat from its hunger and misery that caused Marx to regard revolution as the sole means to achieve that aim. He did not proceed from the proletariat to revolution. Indeed he chose a path proceeding in a directly contrary direction . . . ; it was in his search for a means by which to achieve this revolution that Marx discovered the proletariat.

(Arthur Rosenberg: *A History of Bolshevism*, p. 3)

"In 1848-9 Marx and Engels published in Cologne the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* as 'a mouthpiece of democracy'. It proved to be the most daring and most influential newspaper at the disposal of German democracy. . . .

"It was not a workman's paper in the customary meaning of the word. Indeed the various occupational and class interests of the workers received scant attention in its pages. . . .

(Arthur Rosenberg, *ibid.*, p. 12)

"The Party organisation was looked upon by Marx and Engels simply as a medium through which they could better influence the working class as a whole. . . .

"On 13th February 1851, Engels gave open expression to these views in a letter to Marx. He wrote:

"Have we not pretended for many years that Krethi Plethi was our Party, although we had no Party there, and those whom we at least officially recognised as members of our Party . . . did not comprehend the very ABC of our movement? What have we to do with a Party that is nothing more than a herd of asses, and that swears by us because its members look upon us as their equals?"

"It may be discerned clearly from this," Rosenberg added, "how in those days Marxism was introduced into the working classes as something extraneous to them."

(Arthur Rosenberg, *ibid.*, pp. 14-15)

Similarly, the principal leaders of Soviet Russia until the advent of the dictator Stalin were of the same enigmatic race:

"I earnestly desire to avoid writing one single line which might tend to inflame a festering wound", wrote Sarolea in 1924. "But

it is no use denying that the festering wound is there. . . . That the Jews have played a leading part in the Bolshevik upheaval and are still playing a leading part in the Bolshevik Government is a proposition which no one will deny who has taken the trouble to study Russian affairs at first hand. I am quite ready to admit . . . that the Jewish leaders are only an infinitesimal fraction. But it is none the less true that those few Jewish leaders are the masters of Russia, even as the fifteen hundred Anglo-Indian civil servants are the masters of India. For any traveller in Russia to deny such a truth would be to deny the evidence of his own senses."

(Charles Sarolea: *Impressions of Soviet Russia*, pp. 158-9)

Their dictatorship fell not only upon Russia but upon every country in Central Europe when Bolshevism attempted to implant itself by a bloody reign of terror; under Bela Kuhn and Szamuely at Budapest, Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg at Berlin, and Kurt Eisner and Max Lieven at Munich.

In this, it is worth noting that their deeds are absolutely consistent with their words, and in support of this contention we quote below from the foremost Jewish theoreticians of Bolshevik terrorism: Karl Marx, Engels, Leon Trotsky and Neumann.

First, let us take a passage from Marx written only two years before his death, which puts in clear relief his ideas about dictatorship and violence. In a letter to the Dutch Social-Democrat, Domela Nieuwenhuys, Marx wrote on 22nd February 1881:

"A socialist government cannot put itself at the head of a country if adequate conditions do not exist to enable it immediately to take the requisite measures to terrify the bourgeoisie and so achieve the first step for the unfolding of its policy."

(*Pravda*, 14th March 1928; quoted by Leon de Poncins in *Le Plan Communiste d'Insurrection armée*, p. 17)

This is Engel's judgment on the commune:

"The revolution is undoubtedly the most authoritarian thing in the world. Revolution is an act in which one section of the population imposes its will upon the other by rifles, bayonets, guns, and other such exceedingly authoritarian means. And the party which has won is necessarily compelled to maintain its rule by means of that fear which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. If the commune of Paris had not relied upon the armed people as against the bourgeoisie, would it have maintained itself more than twenty-four hours? Are we not, on the contrary, justified in reproaching

the commune for having employed this authority too little? (p. 20)

"As long as the proletariat still needs the State, it needs it not in the interests of freedom, but in order to suppress its opponents."

(Engels, quoted by Lenin in *The Proletarian Revolution and Kautsky the Renegade*, p. 24)

Trotsky, for his part, has written a whole book to justify the necessity of the red terror, called *Defence of Terrorism*, from which we have taken the following:

"The man who repudiates terrorism in principle, i.e. repudiates measures of suppression and intimidation towards determined and armed counter-revolution, must reject all idea of the political supremacy of the working class and its revolutionary dictatorship. The man who repudiates the dictatorship of the proletariat repudiates the Socialist revolution, and digs the grave of Socialism. . . . (pp. 23-24)

"The Red Terror is a weapon utilised against a class doomed to destruction, which does not wish to perish. If the White Terror can only retard the historical rise of the proletariat, the Red Terror hastens the destruction of the bourgeoisie. This hastening—a pure question of acceleration—is at certain periods of decisive importance. Without the Red Terror, the Russian bourgeoisie, together with the world bourgeoisie, would throttle us long before the coming of the revolution in Europe. One must be blind not to see this, or a swindler to deny it.

"The man who recognises the revolutionary historic importance of the very fact of the existence of the Soviet system must also sanction the Red Terror. . . . (pp. 60-61)

"Concerning the destruction of which the Commune is accused, and of which now the Soviet Government is accused, Marx speaks as of 'an inevitable and comparatively insignificant episode in the titanic struggle of the new-born order with the old in its collapse'. Destruction and cruelty are inevitable in any war. Only sycophants can consider them a crime 'in the war of the slaves against their oppressors, the only just war in history' (Marx)."

(L. Trotsky: *The Defence of Terrorism*, p. 89)

Let us not forget that Trotsky describes as sycophants those who were horrified by the crimes of genocide committed by the Soviets on their countrymen.

Finally, Neumann, under the nom de plume of Neuberg, wrote a thick book called *L'Insurrection armée* as a guide towards the

practical application of revolutionary terrorism, a résumé of which was published in Leon de Poncin's: *Le Plan Communiste d'Insurrection armée*, 1939.

In 1927 Neumann, who was regarded as an expert in the art of insurrection, was sent to China by Moscow with Borodin and Galen (General Blücher), both of whom were Jewish, to organise the Communist uprisings in Shanghai and Canton.

It was put down in blood by Chiang Kai-shek, and most of the Communist leaders were executed. Only Mao Tse-tung and two or three of the present rulers of Communist China escaped the massacre and undertook the famous retreat of "the long march" in order to avoid falling into the hands of the troops pursuing them. Neumann, Borodin and Galen fled to Russia, and after this failure Neumann's name went down in history as the "Butcher of Canton". Later he took part as a Soviet delegate in the Spanish civil war, and finally all three disappeared and were executed by Stalin at the famous Moscow trial.

When the Soviet armies began to invade Eastern Germany in their march upon Berlin, the celebrated Jewish journalist Ilya Ehrenburg proclaimed to the winds:

"Kill! Kill! In the German race there is nothing but evil; not one among the living, not one among the yet unborn but is evil! Follow the precepts of Comrade Stalin. Stamp out the Fascist beast once and for all in its lair! Use force and break the racial pride of the Germanic women. Take them as your lawful booty. Kill! as you storm onwards kill, you gallant soldiers of the Red Army!"

(Quoted by Admiral Doenitz in:
Memoirs, Forty Years and Twenty Days, p. 431)

They were not only the theorists of the Red Terror; they were the principal agents in carrying it out.

"Unfortunately, not only have men belonging to the Jewish race played a very large part both in the beginning and in the development of the Bolshevik Revolution, but they have also been the chief participators in some of the worst crimes of that Revolution. In the annals of terrorism there are four names which stand out in sinister isolation—Jankel Yourowski, the monster who shot down the twelve members of the Imperial family in the cellars of the Elpatinski House in Yekaterinburg, including the four young daughters of the Tsar; Moses Uritski, the first executioner-in-chief of the Tcheka; Bela Kun, the butcher of Budapest and of the Crimea; Djerdjinski, the present Inquisitor-General of

the Tcheka. Of those four names there is not one who is a Russian. One of the four is a Pole; the three others happen to be Jews."

(C. Sarolea, *Impressions of Soviet Russia*, pp. 160-1)

And Sarolea concluded with these prophetic words:

"We have simply to admit the fact that the Bolshevik Revolution has been largely engineered by men belonging to the Jewish race. We have to face the further fact that the deeds committed by those men have roused fierce vindictive passions in the hearts of the Russian people. . . . (p. 159)

"The Bolshevik fever will burn itself out; but the anti-Semitic passion will grow as Bolshevism decreases. Already signs of the coming storm are visible all over Central Europe. . . . What, then, must we not expect in Russia? For not only is the anti-Semitic passion infinitely greater in Russia than in any other country, but it also affects very much larger numbers."

(C. Sarolea, *ibid.*, p. 166)

A propos of the Spanish revolution the documents published in the Official Report of the Portuguese Government to the Committee of Non-Intervention provide a vivid illustration of the Communist plan for armed insurrection, from which the following extract has been taken:

". . . In the session on the 27th February the Komintern paid special attention to the question of the 'bolshevisation' of Spain. This organisation sent to the Peninsular two technicians, both well-known revolutionaries, to direct the work of the Communists: Bela Kun and Losovski. They were given ample financial resources and ordered to achieve the Communist objectives. . . .

"The agitator Bela Kun and his comrades Losovski, Janson, Riedal Priamo (or Primakoff), Berzine and Neumann arrived at Barcelona in March and set to work without delay. . . .

"The sight of their work must fill the organisers of the Spanish revolution with satisfaction. Spain is a sea of blood. The immense wealth, the masterpieces which all the gold in the world could not reconstruct and the historical relics which formed a patrimony common to many countries have been sacrificed and lost for ever. A great number of some of the highest moral, artistic and intellectual achievements lie shrouded in the eternal silence of death.

"All parts of the programme drawn up some months ago by the Komintern have been carried out in the territory subject to the Government of Madrid. If they have not been put into execution throughout the country, it is because the national reaction did not permit it.

"Everything had been foreseen from a distance and executed methodically."

Finally, the heads of the Soviet régimes installed by Moscow in the satellite countries after the war were Jewish: Rakosi in Hungary, Anna Pauker in Roumania, Slansky in Czecho-Slovakia and Jacob Berman in Poland.

For, as Arthur Bliss Lane, the former United States Ambassador to Poland (1944-7), said:

"... the growing anti-Semitism, even our Jewish sources admitted, was caused by the great unpopularity of the Jews in key government positions. These men included Minc, Berman, Olszewski (whose real name was said to be Specht), Radkiewicz and Spychalski. Our Jewish friends said that the Jews in Poland had little regard for the government and resented the implication that the Jews in it were representative of their people. I told the Department of State that, from the reports received, I believed there was bitter feeling within the militia against the Jews because the Security Police, controlled by Radkiewicz, dominated the militia and the Army, and a Russian general, Kiziewicz, dominated the Internal Security Police (K.B.W.). It was known, furthermore, that both the U.B. and the K.B.W. had, among their members, many Jews of Russian origin."

(A. B. Lane, U.S.A. Ambassador to Poland, 1944-7, in *I Saw Poland Betrayed*, pp. 250-1)

Since then, in Russia as in the satellite countries, they have been progressively eliminated from positions of control to be replaced by Russians and natives.

But before their eviction the chiefs of the terrible secret police were often of Jewish origin. The Jewish writer Fejtö, a convert of Hungarian origin, says in his excellent work, *Les Juifs et l'Anti-sémitisme dans les Pays communistes*:

"The highest placed amongst the Polish Communist Jews serving the Terror was Jacob Berman. . . . (p. 71)

and speaking of Hungary he tells us:

"Between 1945 and 1948 . . . the population did not seem to pay much attention to the fact that the higher ranks in the (Hungarian) régime were mainly composed of Jews (Rakosi, Gero, Revai, Vas, Antal Apro, George Lukacs, and others . . .). The country only became aware of this fact after 1948, at which date Communism changed its appearance and became increasingly sectarian and oppressive in its police measures. Several notorious

agents of this oppression, notably Gabor Peter, the Hungarian 'Beria', Mihaly Farkas, Minister of Defence, and his son Wladimir, who was the foremost torturer of the political police, were likewise of Jewish origin. A good many Hungarian Jews already foresaw with terror that the people, enraged by the régime of penury and oppression which the popular democracy had become, would rise up against their tormentors. Once again, as in 1919 after the fall of Bela Kuhn, the Jews seemed predestined to pay the cost of a régime of which some of them appeared to be the principal beneficiaries." (p. 93)

During the present century there have been a number of world shattering political crimes in which men of Jewish race have been the principle instigators. The following are some of the best known cases:

Between 1905 and 1917 in Russia there was a continuous series of violent political crimes to which some of the highest dignitaries of the Czarist régime fell victim including the Czar's uncle, the Grand Duke Sergius, the Prime Minister Plehve, Stolypine and others. The two most prominent leaders of the terrorist organisations responsible for these murders were the Jewish revolutionaries, Guershouni and Azef in collaboration with Silberberg, Max Schweitzer and Routenberg. In 1907 a bomb was thrown at the State Bank in Tiflis killing a number of Cossack Guards, and a considerable quantity of money was stolen for the purpose of financing the Bolshevik agents. The following year, one of the principle organisers, Meyer Genoch Moisevitch Wallach, alias Finkelstein was arrested in Paris charged with being concerned in the theft of 250,000 roubles from the Tiflis Bank. He was deported from France and came to England where he lived under the aliases of Buchmann and Harrison, and on the outbreak of the First World War he was active in stopping recruiting among the Jews of the East End of London. With the assistance of two other Jewish revolutionaries from Moscow, Holtzmann and Fineberg he was concerned with the circulation of seditious literature on behalf of Germany. After the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 he subsequently became Soviet Ambassador to the Court of St. James in London, assuming the name of Maxim Litvinoff. Later he became President of the Council of the League of Nations.

The assassination, after the war of Count Stephen Tiza, Prime Minister of Hungary was at the instigation of three Jewish terrorists, Keri, Fenyes and Pogany.

Count Stürgkh, Prime Minister of Austria was murdered by the Socialist Jew Adler, son of the leader of the Austrian Socialist Democratic Party.

Hetman Petlioura was assassinated in Paris by the Jewish Communist Schwartzbart.

In 1938, the German diplomat, von Rath was assassinated in Paris by the young Jew Grynspan.

The British High Commissioner in Cairo, Lord Moyne was assassinated by Jewish terrorists.

The dynamite outrage on the King David Hotel in Jerusalem which killed a great many British officers was undertaken by a Jewish underground movement.

Both Count Bernadotte of Sweden, plenipotentiary of the United Nations and Colonel Sérot of France fell victim to Jewish assassins.

Finally, of recent years there was the murder of Lee Oswald, the assassin of President Kennedy by Jack Rubinstein.

Who sows the wind reaps a whirlwind. When you unleash revolutionary terror on the world it is not surprising if you fall victim to it yourself one day. It is the innate justice of history.

When terrorism is exerted in the revolutionary sense, described in school text books as "the sense of history", and when it is directed by Jews, it is a social experience "broad, human and generous", despite the millions of deaths it involves.

When revolutionary violence turns against its instigators and the victims are Jewish, then it becomes a "morbid cancer of civilisation", a "sadistic form of anti-Jewish hatred" and a "retrogression by humanity towards the dark ages of medieval obscurantism". The Jews become the innocent victims of anti-Semite barbarity and the martyrs of humanity.

II

ETERNAL ANTAGONISM

THE irreducible antagonism with which Judaism has opposed Christianity for 2,000 years is the key and mainspring of modern subversion—a position which, as we have attempted to show by quotations from learned and respected Jewish doctors and scholars, far from being preposterous, as it may at first appear, is quite understandable when one grasps that it flows naturally from the Judaic mind and spirit. For, as Darmesteter tells us, "the Jew championed reason against the mythical world of the spirit . . . during the intellectual night of the Middle Ages . . . and he understood as nobody else did how to find the vulnerable points in its doctrine. . . . He was the doctor of unbelief." (Quoted by A. Spire in *Quelques Juifs*, p. 233)

The advent of Christ was a national catastrophe for the Jewish people, especially for its leaders. Until then they, and they alone, had been the Sons of the Covenant; they had been its sole high-priests and beneficiaries.

The powerful empires which surrounded them either ignored or treated with scorn the obscure, rather sparsely populated nation of Israel.

In his *Genèse de L'Antisémitisme*, Jules Isaac describes what the Greeks and Romans thought about Israel.

After a time :

"The Greek world became more heedful of the Israelite nation, which it had hitherto regarded as insignificant . . . a singular, incomprehensible people, lacking everything which, in the eyes of the Greeks, gave human life meaning, light and beauty; lacking any visible civilisation or works of art; fanatically pious, but in an obscure faith whose abstract gods could not be formed by the sculptor's chisel and worshipped as images. And yet this nonentity of a people laid claim to everything: it stood up to radiant Hellas; more than that, it dared to preach to the latter, to set itself up as the master of prayer and the Chosen of the Divinity. What astounding incongruity and exasperating folly. The anti-Judaism

engendered in certain Greek circles was primarily a reaction against claims that were considered intolerable and outrageous, a reflex of injured self-esteem, complicated by mistrust, ignorance and misunderstanding. It was destined to spread throughout the whole length and breadth of that world which had been more or less brought under the sway of the hellenes; but originally and essentially it was only one aspect of the violent antagonism which had just arisen in Palestine between the Judeans and Greeks, a mutual war of extermination, as Father Lagrange has said, which was to extend far beyond the borders of Palestine, to fester and subsequently break out into new and bloody conflicts, in which massacres and massacred changed sides frequently, as the strongest side prevailed, and each opponent strained his utmost to mount a fresh pogrom." (p. 70)

The Romans adopted the same attitude:

"It was an unheard of thing to them that the *pax Romana*, Roman order and the imperial religion which was its symbol, should be disputed and shaken by a breed of indecent, superstitious Oriental agitators.

"The quarrel redoubled its fury, solely because the Judeans would not give up the fight," wrote Tacitus. The scoundrels.

"This righteous anger surges throughout Tacitus." (pp. 120-1)

But Israel attached no importance to what the pagans might think or say. It did not feel it was being interfered with because the criticism came from outside. It touched neither Israel's interior cohesion, nor its immeasurable pride, nor its unshakeable belief in an imperial future:

"The little people of Israel, such as the prophets conceived of it, became the navel of the world. Jahve, its god, brought about every event, whether good or bad, and all were related to him. Israel became the centre of the universe and the centre of history. Nothing has existed, nothing does exist and nothing will exist except in terms of its own destiny. This view of prophetic mysticism, so naïve in its vanity and so proud, leads to a veritable religious imperialism. According to the prophets, Israel, by the grace of Jahve, its god, is destined to govern the world; when the people of the servants of Jahve conform to the divine ordinances, the time will come when Israel shall reign over all the earth."

(G. Batault: *Le Problème Juif*, pp. 69-70)

But suddenly there arose up among them a prophet—man or God—who was indeed the son of the royal race of David, and also the

son of the Covenant, heir to the Promise. He claimed that he had been sent from above by God his Father, to carry out and complete the promise of the Covenant. "I am not come to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it." (Matthew v. 17). And in proof of his mission he performed a number of unheard of wonders; the multitudes, subdued, followed him.

But—and this is the most serious point about his mission—he interpreted the Promise in a new and entirely different sense, which threatened to overturn and destroy the whole proud Judaic edifice, by rendering it spiritual and universal.

The realisation of the Promise was transferred from the material to the spiritual level; it overflowed beyond national limits and was no longer reserved to the Jews as its sole beneficiaries, but extended to include the whole world.

"The idea of a celestial fatherland common to all souls replaced that of Jerusalem of the Jews; it no longer conceived of the flowering of one race nor of the triumph of one nation, for the chosen people was lowered to the level of just one among the peoples. This was something to which neither the pride nor the religious nationalism of the Jews could consent, it was contrary to the Law and the Prophets, and contrary to the messianic promises. The time was to come when the kingdoms would submit to Israel." (G. Batault, *ibid.*, p. 91)

The chief-priests and the pharisees, unable to tolerate such a blasphemy and infringement of their privileges, delivered the dangerous agitator to the Romans, in order to be rid of him, and had him put to death.

But Christ rose from the dead and his teaching spread like a train of powder across the ancient world. His disciples were denounced to the Roman authorities as rebels against the emperor, and they were pursued, fed to the beasts, tormented and crucified. However, the flood rose unceasing, penetrated the higher spheres of Imperial power, and suddenly the world swung in favour of the Church of Christ:

"On 28th October A.D. 312, the battle of Milvian Bridge took place. Constantine was victorious against Maxentius, who was believed to have drowned in the waters of the Tiber.

"One battle sufficed to change the face of the world and its religious countenance. . . .

"Constantine's victory is rightly considered as the starting-point of a new era, that of the Christian empire. It is true that its immediate result seems to have been the establishment of the

liberty and equality of creeds (313). . . . Thenceforward, for reasons which have not been completely clarified, the victorious Constantine united his destiny with the Church of Christ, and the latter had won the game. The Church conquered and retained imperial favour, it took a privileged position within the State, and began to move towards even greater and more perilous heights, where the Church was closely linked with the State and became, in other words, a State Church. A great and a surprising revolution, deplored by some and praised by others, one of the most important revolutions in History, to which the reign of Constantine was only a prelude, since it reached its completion in the extraordinary and chaotic fourth century. But the unheard of success of the Church was to bring in its wake the misfortune of the Synagogue, for which the fourth century was a fatal epoch, marking the commencement of a future of anguish, sorrow and catastrophes."

(Jules Isaac: *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, pp. 155-6)

The Jews did not then, and they do not now, accept this defeat. The rupture between Judaism and Christianity is total. The position is one of mutual, unyielding antagonism. It could hardly be stated more clearly than in the following remarkable passage from the Jewish convert, Fejtö:

"If the Jew is right, Christianity is only an illusion.

"If Christianity is right, the Jew is, in the most favourable hypothesis, an anachronism—the image of something which ought no longer to exist.

"Christianity, for the Jew, means the renunciation of a monopoly and of a 'nationalist' if not to say racist interpretation of 'the election'; it means opening oneself to human fraternisation and at the same time a great 'amen' to God and all that God decides; it means accepting suffering and death, and it means renouncing one's pride, one's love and one's distrust of Self.

"I know of no other people that has been submitted to such a difficult trial by Christianity.

"Since for no other people has the change to Christianity signified, in the short or long run, the disappearance of the people itself as such. No other peoples' religious traditions, which faith in Christ demanded they should abandon, were so intimately connected with all the conditions of their civil existence.

"For the other peoples of the Roman empire, religion was in effect a 'superstructure' or an embellishment. It could be replaced without shaking the edifice. But for the Jew, religion was the infrastructure, the *raison d'être*, the base of his being. But the apostles

invited them to sell all their goods, for Heaven was at hand and the gates beyond were wide open. The Jew said: no, it is not true, it cannot be true that God wants me to do this. Prove it to me.

"And it is at that point that we reach the other reason (or pretext) which justifies the Jew saying 'no' to Christ—that he did not correspond to the idea—whether true or false—which the Jew had developed of the Messiah, and of his own salvation."

(F. Fejtö: *Dieu et Son Juif*, pp. 34, 190-2)

"By claiming to be the true 'Israel'—Israel according to the 'spirit' and not according to the 'contemptible' flesh—Christian theology intends to permanently replace Israel. Unfortunately, Israel has not disappeared and does not want to do so."

(J. Jehouda: *L'Antisémitisme, Miroir du Monde*, p. 50)

The irremediable difference is to do with Jesus:

"If we take it that he did exist in history, for the Jew he was neither God nor the son of God. The most extreme concession the Jew can possibly make was expressed by Joseph Klauzner, according to whom Jesus, whom he said was neither the Messiah, nor a Prophet, nor a lawgiver, nor the founder of a religion, nor tanna, nor rabbi, nor pharisee, 'is considered as a great moralist and artist in the use of parables by the Jewish nation . . . the day when he is cleared of the stories of his miracles and mysticism, the Book of the Morality of Jesus will become one of the most precious jewels of Jewish literature of all time'.

"Christianity is essentially preoccupied with the individual salvation of man. Judaism only contemplates the salvation of the House of Israel, which alone can permit the salvation of the seventy nations of the universe. For centuries this has been the constant objective of the talmudists and cabbalists. They have one fundamental aim: to maintain one community on which the salvation of the whole world depends. Only by virtue of his rite is the Jew allowed to integrate with his community."

(Rabi: *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, pp. 203-204)

"The steps by which the Christian faith conquered its independence were to lead it rapidly and inevitably into a merciless war against Israel 'according to the flesh', the new Church proclaiming itself the true Israel of God and the only Israel 'according to the spirit'. But was the gravity of such a claim fully realised? It amounted to something much worse than a slander on

the Jewish people; it was an attempt to make away with its spark of life, with its sacred fire, one could even say with its soul; and even more—so closely are the spiritual and temporal elements linked to each other—it was an attempt to make away with its place in the sun, with its privileged status in the Empire.”

(J. Isaac, *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, p. 150)

Christianity was on the ascendance for fifteen centuries, and throughout the whole of the medieval period Judaism was powerless to influence the destinies of nations. Profiting from the tolerance of the authorities and from the protection of the Popes, it could only live on, waiting for an opportunity to penetrate the monolithic Christian structure from within. It looks upon this period as one of dark obscurantism and barbarity, for Israel tends to judge the world in relation to itself, itself being the salt of the earth and the measure of all things.

Then, with the Renaissance and the Reformation, the unity of the Faith was broken. Judaism advanced through the breach which had thus been opened and thenceforward threw its weight behind every movement which weakened and unsettled Christianity—the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Revolution of 1789 and Marxism.

Throughout the whole of this period, Darmesteter tells us:

“The Jew championed reason against the mythical world of the spirit. It was with him that thought took refuge during the intellectual night of the Middle Ages. Provoked by the Church, which sought to persuade him, having in vain attempted to convert him by force, he undermined it by the irony and intelligence of his arguments, and he understood as nobody else did how to find the vulnerable points in its doctrine. He had at his disposal in this search, apart from the wisdom of the sacred scriptures, the redoubtable wisdom of the oppressed. He was the doctor of unbelief; all who were mentally in revolt came to him, either secretly or in broad daylight. He was at work in the vast laboratory of blasphemy under the great emperor Frederick and the princes of Swabia and Aragon. It was he who forged all that deadly arsenal of reasoning and irony which he bequeathed to the sceptics of the Renaissance and the libertines of the grand siècle (the reign of Louis XIV); Voltaire's sarcasm, for example, was nothing more than the resounding echo of a word murmured six centuries previously in the shadow of the ghetto, and even earlier (in the Counter-Evangelists of the first and second centuries) at the time of Celsus and Origen at the very cradle of the Christian religion.”

(Quoted by A. Spire in *Quelques Juifs*, p. 233)

Bernard Lazare, for his part, depicts Jewish anti-Christian action in the eighteenth century:

“In like manner we would have to inquire what was the importance, I will not say of the Jew, but of the Jewish spirit throughout the period of fierce revolt against Christianity which characterised the eighteenth century. We must not forget that in the seventeenth century, scholars like Wagenseil, Bartolucci, Buxtorf and Wolf, had brought forth from oblivion old volumes of Hebrew polemic, written in refutation of the Trinity and Incarnation and attacking all dogmas and forms of Christianity with a bitterness entirely Judaic, and with all the subtlety of those peerless casuists who created the Talmud. They gave to the world not only treatises on questions of doctrine and exegesis, like the *Nizzachon* or the *Chizuk Emunah*, but published blasphemous tractates and pseudo-lives of Jesus, of the character of the *Toldoth Jeshu*. The eighteenth century repeated, concerning Jesus and the Virgin, the outrageous fables invented by the Pharisees of the second century; we find them in Voltaire and in Parry, and their rationalist satire, pellucid and mordant, lives again in Heine, in Boerne and in Disraeli; just as the powerful logic of the ancient rabbis lives again in Karl Marx, and the passionate thirst for liberty of the ancient Hebrew rebels breathes forth again in the glowing soul of Ferdinand Lassalle.”

(B. Lazare: *Anti-Semitism*, pp. 306-307)

According to Jehouda:

“The Renaissance, the Reformation and the Revolution (of 1789) constitute three attempts to rectify Christian mentality by bringing it into tune with the progressive development of reason and science.

“As dogmatic theology began to yield its oppressive control over man's conscience, the Jews began to breathe more freely. . . . The three breaches opened in the decrepid fortress of Christian obscurantism extend over roughly five centuries, in the course of which the Jews were still considered as the pariahs of history. . . .

“If the Jews were still removed from all the intellectual and social activity of the Christian peoples, nevertheless, despite the ostracism to which they were subjected, their thought played a preponderant though unacknowledged role in the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Revolution, which are all indirectly stamped with its mark . . . and it is certainly not by chance that these attempts (to rectify Christian mentality) were inspired by the

assiduous study of Jewish sources at a time when the Jews were still looked upon with suspicion and mistrust."

(J. Jehouda: *L'Antisémitisme, Miroir du Monde*, pp. 161-2)

Jehouda gives us concrete examples of the part played by Jewish proselytizers such as Pico de Mirandola and John Reuchlin in this transformation of Christianity.

Pico de Mirandola, who died in Florence in 1494, was a hebraiser who devoted himself to studying the Cabbala under the direction of Jewish masters such as Jehuda Abravanel:

"It was in the princely house of Pico de Mirandola that the Jewish scholars used to meet. . . . The discovery of the Jewish Cabbala, which he imparted to various enlightened Christians contributed far more than the return to Greek sources to the extraordinary spiritual blossoming which is known as the Renaissance. About half a century later, the rehabilitation of the Talmud was to lead to the Reformation . . . Pico de Mirandola had understood that the indispensable purification of Christian dogma could only be effected after a profound study of the authentic Jewish Cabbala. . . .

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 164)

"With the Reformation, which broke out in Germany fifty years after the Renaissance, the universality of the Church was destroyed. A new age began. The Renaissance had not succeeded in purifying Christian dogma, and the Reformation finished by complicating even more 'the problem' of Christianity, evident though it was. It may be summarised as a question of how to overcome its fundamental dualism, the contradictory two-fold origin in Jerusalem and Athens to which Rome succeeded. It is indeed a well-known fact that the Reformation was achieved by Luther (1483-1546), Calvin (1509-64) and Zwingli (1484-1531), but it is not so well-known that previously John Reuchlin (1455-1531), Pico de Mirandola's disciple, shook the Christian conscience by suggesting as early as 1494 'that there was nothing higher than hebraic wisdom'. And when in 1509 a renegade Jew, Joseph Pfefferkorn, had the Talmud seized and finally obtained, after several previous attempts, the definite condemnation of this collective compendium which contains a thousand years of Jewish wisdom, John Reuchlin did not shrink from exposing himself to every menace and danger in order to defend before the Emperor and the Pope the extraordinary value of the Talmud, whose veritable meaning he had fathomed.

"Reuchlin advocated returning to Jewish sources as well as to

ancient texts. Finally, he won his case against the convert Pfefferkorn, who loudly demanded the destruction of the Talmud. 'The new spirit which was to revolutionise the whole of Europe became apparent with regard to the Jews and the Talmud', wrote the historian Graetz. However, the Reformation, which made known the bare text of the Bible, proved even more incapable than the Renaissance of purifying Christianity of its congenital anti-Semitism. One is astonished to find that there were as many Protestant as Catholic anti-Semites. The Reformation, finding itself in an intellectual impasse, adopted the principle of fideism, thus excluding all possibility of its reasoning its faith. . . .

"The Reformation itself submitted to the irresistible attraction of the 'Greek miracle', which splits thought by separating it from faith and by adopting, albeit it imperceptibly, the pagan laicism which prepares the ground for atheism. The French Revolution marked the beginning of atheism in the history of Christian peoples and, declaredly anti-religious, it continues, through the influence of Russian Communism, to make a powerful contribution to the dechristianisation of the Christian world. . . .

"The third attempt to amend the Christian position, after the failure of reformed Christianity to unite, took place under the impetus of the French Revolution.

"Although the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution which followed it liberated the Jew in the social and political fields, they both hold the monotheistic religion of Israel in the same contempt as Christian theology. . . .

"Laicism, to which the Revolution gave birth, confers on the Jew his dignity as a man, but Christian theology has not yet abolished its spiritual contempt for him. This accounts for the two-fold attitude of the modern world with regard to the Jew and for the successive outbursts of anti-Semitism. . . .

"Thus anti-Semitism, the foot-and-mouth-disease of Christianity, is still rebellious even after the three attempts to purify Christian dogma. But, notwithstanding all the successive purgings, Christianity remains firmly fastened to its mythical dogmatism which inevitably engenders anti-Semitism. The affirmation that Christianity holds out to Judaism the last phase of its spiritual future must in the end be completely rethought from top to bottom in the interests of Christianity itself, and thus of western civilisation. . . .

(Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, pp. 169, 170, 172-4)

"Whoever looks deep into the meaning of universal history, in order to see it as a whole, discovers that from antiquity until the present day it has been penetrated and fashioned unceasingly

by two contrary currents, known under various names: messianism and anti-Semitism. . . .

"But the profound meaning of history, which remains unaltered in every epoch, is that of a veiled or open struggle between the forces working for the advancement of humanity and those that cling to coagulated interests, obstinately determined to keep them in existence to the detriment of what is to come.

"For messianism and anti-Semitism constitute the two opposite poles of the progress of humanity. Anti-semitism is the negative pole of messianism. . . ." (Joshua Jehouda, *ibid.*, p. 186)

Today the attack is renewed under the banner of ecumenism and the war is being carried into the very interior of the Church itself. Supported by progressive parties, the spiritual leaders of World Jewry are asking for a reconsideration of the Church's traditional doctrine on Judaism, as we showed in the first three chapters of this work.

We are told that reconciliation is possible and desirable. We are the first to agree that it is desirable, but it is far more difficult to defend the proposition that it is possible. For people of the Jewish faith, steeped in the Talmud, reconciliation, as we have demonstrated, means nothing less than the abandonment by Christianity in its entirety of everything that constitutes the essence of its doctrine, and its integral return to Judaism, which for its part intends to yield nothing, and firmly maintains its position of intransigence.

All the Jewish thinkers, the rabbis and the leaders of Judaism are unanimous on this point. Hear what Andre Spire has to say, speaking about Darmesteter:

"Beyond every confession, above every dogma, he (the Jew) has remained anchored to the spirit of the Scriptures. By an original twist of thought, he incorporates the most attractive features of Christianity into Judaism and, leading the Church back to the synagogue, reconciles the mother with her daughter in an ideal Jerusalem. But it is the daughter, as one would expect, who recognises her wrongs and confesses her errors."

(A. Spire, *Quelques Juifs*, p. 255)

Joshua Jehouda writes:

"A modern prophet once exclaimed: 'Shame and curse on you Christian peoples if you obstinately persist in stifling the monotheistic tradition of Israel. For without the renewal of monotheistic messianism there is no hope of salvation for you and the rest of the world.'"

(J. Jehouda: *Antisémitisme*, *Miroir du Monde*, p. 349)

Rabi makes the following comment:

"It is not the cross which will repair the schism between the Jewish people and the rest of the nations, as Lovsky believes. It will only become possible when the world truly accepts the Jewish idea of common filiation. Man need seek no other moral and history no other end."

(Rabi: *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, p. 186)

Elie Benamozegh, one of the most eminent Jewish thinkers, who is known as "the Plato of Italian Judaism", wrote an important introduction to his work *Israel et l'Humanité* which perfectly summarises Jewish thought on this subject, of which we give a brief account here.

After describing the religious crisis in the world, Elie Benamozegh thinks that the only way to resolve it is by reaching religious unity and he examines the conditions under which agreement should be reached.

In the view of this rabbi, a fervent cabbalist, the religion of the future could not be rationalism, which, issuing solely from the human mind, only clings to intelligible and changing things. For religion, the act of adoration and worship of the Absolute, surpasses our senses and faculties and implies a truth founded upon Revelation.

Only the religions that have sprung from the Bible and tradition, only Judaism, Christianity and Islam fulfill these conditions.

But among them, Judaism occupies a pre-eminent position. The first-born of the children of God, the guardian of messianism, it is to Israel that the priestly function belongs by right in the great family of the nations, for in antiquity the first-born:

"... was the priest of the family who carried out the orders of his father and took his place in his absence. The sacred things were in his charge, he officiated for the family, he taught them, he gave them his blessing. In recognition of his services, he was given a double share of the paternal inheritance and the consecration or imposition of hands. . . . Such was the Jewish conception of the world. In heaven, one sole God the father of all men, and on earth one family of peoples among whom Israel is the first-born, charged with the priestly function of teaching and administering the true religion of humanity."

(E. Benamozegh: *Israel et l'Humanité*, p. 40)

Thus Judaism is to become the religion of the human race and the Jewish conception of the world is to prevail over every other.

Christianity, issued from Hebraism, is to return to the older and

more authentically divine tradition which formed it, in spite of its own venerable and antique tradition. The excessive number of Christian sects, its errors and discords and the obscurity of its dogmas, no longer corresponds to the needs of modern times. In order to continue to exist, it must reform its defects by accepting the ideal that Judaism is based on man and on society and by returning to the primitive faith in God and in his revelation. On this condition, it will preserve its messianic character, it will unite with Judaism in order to secure the religious future of humanity, and it will remain the religion of the Gentiles:

"The reconciliation dreamt of by the early Christians as a condition of the Parousia, or the final coming of Jesus, the return of the Jews to the bosom of the Church, without which, as all the Christian communions agree, the work of Redemption is incomplete, this return we say will take place not in truth as it is expected to happen, but in the only genuine, logical and lasting fashion possible, and above all in the only way in which it will benefit the human race. It will be a reunion between the Hebrew religion and the others that have sprung from it and . . . 'the return of the children's heart to their fathers'."

(E. Benamozegh, *ibid.*, p. 48)

The defence of the traditional Christian standpoint penned in answer to these criticisms, with which we conclude this chapter, is taken from *Le Malheur d'Israel* by the Jewish writer, Dr. Roudinesco:

"The persistence to our day of this small community in the face of unheard of persecution and suffering has been described as a Jewish miracle. Their survival is not a miracle; at best it may be called a misfortune. The veritable Jewish miracle is the spiritual conquest of humanity by Christianity. The mission of the chosen people has long since terminated. Those of the Jews who hope to complete Christianity one day by a renewed messianism ignore the fundamental laws of the evolution of humanity." (pp. 197-8)

12

"PORTRAIT OF A JEW"

IN 1962 a Jewish writer from Tunis, A. Memmi, who had been living for many years in France, published a book called *Portrait of a Jew*.

This work is highly instructive for it does in effect present us with a portrait depicting, with the utmost clarity, the profound reactions of a Jew confronted with the old Christian civilisation of a nation such as France, a reaction which is typical not of France alone but of every Christian country.

Memmi's discomfort and apprehension as soon as it is a question of anything to do with France's past history is conspicuous in the following passages, which in a remarkable way confirm and summarise the points we have been making in the previous chapters of Part II of this work.

"No Gauls, please. Enough of Celts, ancient Romans and conquering Arabs! For then, I find myself naked and alone: my own ancestors were neither Gauls, Celts, Slavs, ancient Romans, Arabs, or Turks. . . ."

"I have never been able to say 'We' in referring to those historical pedigrees on which my fellow-citizens pride themselves. I have never heard another Jew say 'We' without wincing, without vaguely suspecting him of an inadvertent blunder, of complacency or of a slip of the tongue."

(A. Memmi: *Portrait of a Jew*, p. 199)

Thus there is racial and national antagonism between the Jews and the nations, but, deeper still, there is religious antagonism:

"When, several years ago, I left Tunisia to come to France, I knew that I was leaving a Moslem country, but I did not understand that I was going to a Catholic country. A few weeks were enough to impress that fact on me. . . ."

"I quickly discovered that French reality is an inextricable mixture of liberalism and Catholicism, clericalism and anti-cleri-

calism at the same time . . . but the common Christian background is everywhere—sometimes more or less buried, other times more or less obvious. . . .

"France remains a profoundly Catholic country just as America is a Protestant country. . . .

"When I travel in the interior of this country, what do they show me with righteous pride? What do I ask myself spontaneously to see because I know that they are worth seeing, if not churches, chapels, baptisteries, statues of Virgins, objects of worship and very few other things. I have verified the accuracy of those descriptions by orthodox writers: the villages are crowded around their churches, around bell-towers that can be seen from afar and that really do seem to protect them.

"Is this only so in France? By no means. I was stunned, outraged, and then wryly amused, when I read in the Italian newspapers the solemn declaration of Togliatti, leader of the Italian Communists, encouraging and blessing 'the Communist communicants'. I am well aware that it was only a matter of *strategy*: but if there must be strategy, there is a reality to evade. Now the reality of the Italian people is profoundly Catholic, like Polish reality, Spanish reality, etc.

"My religious situation is the result not so much of the degree of my profound religion, but of the fact that I do not belong to the religion of the men among whom I live, that I am a Jew among non-Jews. And this also means that my children, my relatives, my friends frequently find themselves in the same situation. I am always in a certain way outside of the religious world, the culture and the society to which I otherwise belong.

"The law of Christian countries is a law of thinly disguised and often proclaimed Christian inspiration; the law of Moslem countries is a Moslem law, taken for granted and openly acknowledged. . . .

"The religion of non-Jews is, in fact, everywhere—on the street as in institutions, in shop-windows and newspapers, in monuments, in conversations, in the very air itself: art, morals and philosophy are as Christian as law and geography. The philosophic tradition taught in the schools, the great motifs of painting and sculpture, are as impregnated with Christianity as are the laws of marriage and divorce. When I was on the Riviera last year I amused myself noting the villages that bear the names of saints: St. Tropez, St. Maxime, St. Raphael, St. Aygulf. Their number is astonishing. It is the same, for that matter, in the stations of the Paris Metro. My first irritation against Paris, a city I love so dearly in other respects, had a religious basis, if I remember

correctly. Working for part of the day on a miserable job, I used to stay up late at night to get ahead in my studies. Every morning I was awakened—and to my exasperation several times in succession—by bells ringing at full peal, continuing at great length, pausing, and then returning to the charge just as I was dozing off again! True, I was living in a small hotel a few steps away from a church but in this city you are always two steps away from a church . . . those bells summoned men to duties they shared with other men and were a symbol of their origin; at the same time, for me they sounded the signal of my exclusion from that community. I was in a Catholic country; everyone must find those matin bells normal and perhaps pleasant—except me and those like me who were embarrassed and annoyed. A hopeless rebellion, however: the non-Jews, who were not annoyed, nor perhaps even awakened, represented numbers and power. Whatever concerns them, whatever they approve of, is lawful. Those bells are merely the familiar echo of their common soul. . . .

(A. Memmi, *ibid.*, pp. 184-8)

"Do Christians realise what the name of Jesus, their God, can mean to a Jew? For a Christian, even an atheist, it evokes, or at least has evoked at some time, a being infinitely good, who offers himself as The Good, who desires at least to carry on the torch of all bygone philosophies and all morals. For the Christian who is still a believer, Jesus epitomises and fulfils the better part of himself. The Christian who has ceased to believe no longer takes that ideal seriously; he may even resent it, accuse the priests of incompetency or even of deception; but though he denounces it as an illusion he generally leaves no doubt as to the grandeur and beauty of that illusion. To the Jew who still believes and professes his own religion, Christianity is the greatest theological and metaphysical usurpation in history; it is a spiritual scandal, a subversion and blasphemy. To all Jews, even if they are atheists, the name of Jesus is the symbol of a threat, of that great threat that has hung over their heads for centuries and which may, any moment, burst forth in catastrophes of which they know neither the cause nor the prevention. That name is part of the accusation, absurd and frenzied, but so efficiently cruel, that makes social life barely liveable. That name has, in fact, come to be one of the signs, one of the names of the immense apparatus that surrounds the Jew, condemns him and excludes him. I hope my Christian friends will forgive me. That they may better understand, let me say that to the Jews, their God is, in a way, the Devil, if, as they say, the Devil is the symbol and essence of all

evil on earth, iniquitous and all-powerful, incomprehensible and bent on crushing helpless human beings.

"One day in Tunis, an idiot Jew (we always had a certain number of them who haunted cemeteries and community gatherings) seeing a Christian funeral pass, was suddenly seized with an uncontrollable rage. Knife in hand, he flung himself on the funeral procession which scattered terror-stricken in all directions. But the idiot, paying no attention to the crowd screaming in terror, rushed straight at the acolyte . . . grabbed the cross out of his hands, flung it on the ground and trampled it furiously.

"I did not understand his action until later. Anxiety expresses itself as best it can; the idiot reacted in his own way to our common malaise before that world of crosses, priests and churches, those concentrated symbols of hostility, the strangeness of the world that surrounds us the moment we leave the narrow confines of the ghetto. . . .

(A. Memmi, *ibid.*, pp. 188-9)

"I am now convinced that the history of peoples, their collective experience, is a religious history; that it is not only marked by religion, but lived and expressed through religion. It was one of our greatest and most disastrous *naïvetés* to have believed, like our Leftists, in the end of religions. It was a great mistake, in our efforts to understand the past of nations, to try to minimise the part religion played. There was no need either to rejoice in it or to deplore it, only to note its extraordinary importance and to take it into account. . . .

(A. Memmi, *ibid.*, p. 190)

"During the Christmas week, scientific and political speeches on the radio and television all begin with the invocation: 'In these days when the hearts of all men are as a little child's. . . .' All men? Not mine certainly; I do not belong in that communion. One of General de Gaulle's first gestures on assuming power was an address to the Pope in which he asked him to bless France and the French. *Is the Jew a part of that France? If so, how would he like to have his country blessed by the Pope, and himself included in it?* In reality, the head of state acts as if the Jew did not exist. And it is true that he scarcely counts, that he dare not even count himself: otherwise why would he permit the chief of state, his representative, to appeal to the Church in his name? The Papal nuncio is the doyen of the diplomatic corps: by what right if not by an admitted pre-eminence of the Catholic religion, which is not his? . . .

"I realise, even as I am saying this, how unconvincing, how

ridiculous my rebellion may seem and how exorbitant my demand. Would I pretend to impose my law on the majority? Is it not normal for a nation to live according to the desires, customs and myths of the greatest number of its citizens? Perfectly normal, I admit immediately. I scarcely see how it could live otherwise. . . .

(A. Memmi, *ibid.*, pp. 191-2)

"What is not normal in all this is my life, different for that reason, in the bosom of the nation. The Jew is the one who does not belong to the religion of the others. I merely wish to draw attention to the difference and those consequences I have experienced, and which are not part of that normality. It is clear that I must live a religion that is not mine, a religion that regulates and sets the rhythm for all collective life. I must take a holiday at Easter and not at Passover. Do not tell me that many non-Jewish citizens also condemn this contamination. Theirs is merely a theoretical condemnation: their daily life is ordered by the common religion, which is at least their own religion and does not tear them to pieces. 'The trouble with you', said one of my non-Jewish friends, half seriously, 'is that you have never been a Christian. . . .'

(A. Memmi, *ibid.*, p. 193)

"I have written elsewhere that as adolescents and later as young men we refused to take seriously the persistence of nations. We lived in enthusiastic expectation of a new age, such as the world had never known before, signs of which we thought we could already detect—the death (which had certainly begun) of religions, families and nations. We had nothing but anger, scorn and irony for the die-hards of history who clung to those residues. Today I see more clearly why we expended so much energy on cultivating those hopes. Certainly the impatient and generous nature of adolescents which drives them to free themselves, and the whole world, of all shackles, is particularly suited to revolutionary ideologies. But, in addition, we were Jews. I am convinced that this had much to do with the vigour of our choice. Beyond our desire to be accepted by the families, religions and nations of non-Jews who rejected and isolated us because we were Jews, we longed to be one with all men and so, at last, become men like others.

"Unfortunately, whether we were deluding ourselves, whether we may have relapsed since then into a period of regression, or whether it is simply that I have grown older, I have to admit that those residues were as stubborn as weeds and persisted in

remaining fundamental structures in the lives of nations, essential aspects of their collective being. The post-war period saw an indisputable religious revival which swept the orthodox parties to power throughout Europe. Because they understood that situation, the Communists, who keep their fingers on the pulse of nations, extolled the 'Catholic communicants', offered their 'outstretched hands' to Christians and called themselves patriots and nationalists. The Socialists did not even need to resort to trickery. . .

"To all appearances we were doomed to religions and nations and for a long time. Once again I am not passing judgment, I am simply stating facts.

"What was going to become of us, of our adolescent hopes? What we felt confusedly, what we were trying to suppress by rejecting the society of those days, I neither can, nor do I wish to make a secret of any longer. The religious state of nations being what it is, and nations being what they are, the Jew finds himself, in a certain measure, outside of the national community. . .

(A. Memmi, *ibid.*, pp. 195-6)

"The history of the country in which I live is, to me, a borrowed history. How could I feel that Joan of Arc is a symbol for me? Would I hear with her the patriotic and Christian voices? Yes, always religion! But show me a way to separate national tradition from religious tradition. . . It is impossible for me to identify myself seriously with the past of any nation."

(A. Memmi, *ibid.*, pp. 197-8)

Since the Jews are not of our race, being "neither Gauls, nor Celts, nor Slavs, nor Romans". (Memmi).

Since our national traditions are completely foreign to them.

Since our chivalry and the past history of its code of honour and self-sacrifice is looked upon by them as a hateful epoch.

Since our religion is "a blasphemy, a spiritual scandal and a subversion". (Memmi).

Since our God is in the eyes of the Jews "in a way, the Devil, that is to say, the symbol and essence of all evil on earth, which makes social life barely liveable". (Memmi).

Since the Evangelists are, according to Jules Isaac, liars and perverters of the truth.

Since our great saints and Fathers of the Church are, again according to Jules Isaac, scurrilous pamphleteers, venomous theologians full of hatred, torturers, the veritable forerunners of Hitler and Streicher, answerable, from a distance, for Auschwitz.

Since our gothic cathedrals are, according to H. Heine, "the most terrible fortresses of our enemies".

Since they take offence at our villages and metro stations named after saints.

Since the bells of our churches injure Jewish ears.

Since in their eyes it is inadmissible that

1. The President of the Republic should attend a Catholic religious ceremony in his official capacity (or Protestant ceremony in a Protestant country)
2. That the Pope should bless our country.
3. That the Papal nuncio should be doyen of the diplomatic corps by virtue of the very fact that he is the nuncio.

Since they find it intolerable that Christian and not Jewish feasts regulate holidays in the calendar.

Since they desire with all their might to see the death agonies of religions, nations and families—of others at least, for the Jewish religion, Jewish families and the Jewish nation preserve their own untouchable character.

And since in France they constitute a minority of scarcely half a million people in a country of fifty million inhabitants, and likewise in every other country in the world except Israel.

Then one is naturally led to ask whether it is lawful, useful, wise or opportune that Jews in our country are or have been :

Ministers and Presidents of the Council,
Ambassadors,
Members of the Académie Française,
Lord Chancellors of the Légion d'Honneur,
Generals,
Rectors of Universities and Inspectors of Public Instruction,
Keepers of the Bibliothèque Nationale,
Chiefs of Police and of the Information Service,
Examining magistrates,
Directors of national banks,
Directors of great national industries: the automobile industry,
the aviation industry, etc.,
Directors of national theatres,
Authors of academic manuals on the History of France,

and likewise in regard to the other nations of the world.

After reading the works of Heinrich Heine, Bernard Lazare, J. Darmesteter, Kadmi-Cohen, Ludwig Lewisohn, Emil Ludwig, Walter Rathenau, Alfred Nossig, Leon Blum, Joshua Jehouda,

Edmond Fleg, Elie Benamozegh, Andre Spire, Elie Faure, Jules Isaac, Rabi, Max I. Dimont, and A. Memmi, one is inevitably led to the conclusion that it is perfectly legitimate and praiseworthy for Jews to defend and maintain their traditions and live in the different Western countries without being harassed or persecuted.

But it is quite inadmissible that they should be allowed to profit from this tolerant attitude in order to undermine, disintegrate and finally destroy our own religious, national and cultural traditions. They style the reactions against them "anti-Semitism", but they are in reality measures of defence to protect the community from a foreign influence, all the more dangerous since it is at work in the heart of our institutions, protected by fraudulent abuse of the term citizenship, calling itself French in France, English in England, German in Germany, and so on. . . .

Indeed, one can go so far as to ask whether it is legitimate, wise and consistent with the respect which the Church has always professed towards the Holy Scriptures, that an assembly of bishops, coming to Rome from all over the world to meet in Council, should seek advice from a Jewish writer, Jules Isaac, with a view to "rectifying and purifying" traditional Christian teaching with regard to Judaism.

Jules Isaac, about whom one of his co-religionists, Rabi, wrote:

"His Jésus et Israel, published in 1948, is the most specific weapon of war against a particularly harmful Christian doctrine."
(Rabi: *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, p. 183)

But, if one is to judge by the Council vote of November 1964, the desiderata of Jules Isaac, the B'nai B'rith and the World Jewish Congress weighed heavier in the minds of the 1,300 bishops and Council fathers than the Evangelists, than St. Augustine, St. John Chrysostom, St. Gregory the Great—and practically all the doctors of the Church and all the Popes—who elaborated the doctrine which is today denounced by Jules Isaac and others as particularly harmful.

PART III

THE COUNCIL'S SOLUTION

THE VATICAN VOTE

At the (Orthodox) Rabbinical Council of America, attended by 900 rabbis representing one and a half million Jews in the U.S.A. and Canada, Rabbi Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik, professor of Talmud at Yeshiva University, told the assembled rabbis:

"We are opposed to any public debate, dialogue or symposium concerning the doctrinal, dogmatic or ritual aspects of our faith.

"There cannot be any mutual understanding concerning these topics, for Jew and Christian will employ different categories and will move within incommensurate frames of reference and evaluation.

"We believe in and are committed to our Maker in a specific manner and we will not question, defend, offer apology, analyse or rationalise our faith in dialogues centred about these 'private' topics which express our personal relationship to the God of Israel."

(Reported in the *Jewish Chronicle*,
28th January, 1966, p. 40)

THE fourth and last session of the Council opened on 14th September 1965, and the schema on the Jewish question—"The schema on non-Christian religions"—was again submitted to the Council Fathers on 14th and 15th October.

After the Pope had refused to promulgate the vote taken in November 1964, the original text was profoundly reshaped by the conciliar commission in charge of the preparation of the schema. The new text submitted for the approval of the Council was distinctly less favourable to Jewish demands and more acceptable to conservative consciences; however, it still contained a few ambiguities which could be interpreted as promising a prudent revision, but a revision nevertheless, of the traditional Catholic attitude towards Judaism, which has remained unaltered for fifteen centuries.

Later we will study the new text, which regulates the position of the Church today with regard to contemporary Judaism, but let us begin with a rapid sketch of this historic vote.

Early in October 1965 the great battle on the Jewish question commenced, and from the start it took an extremely violent turn. In November 1964 the conservative minority had been taken entirely by surprise, but meanwhile it had had time to take stock of the situation, and, realising the extreme gravity of this vote for the Church, it energetically combated the Jewish-Catholic coalition, which was able to dispose of a Press almost entirely at its service.

At the fore in favour of the schema was Cardinal Bea, the theologian Fr. Congar, and papers such as *Le Monde* (H. Fesquet) and *Le Figaro* (Abbé Laurentin). Two arch-bishops and a Bishop led the conservative opposition: Mgr. de Proenca Sigaud, archbishop of Diamantina in Brazil, Mgr. Lefebvre, Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers, and Mgr. Carli, Bishop of Segni in Italy.

The battle was fought with a relentless tenacity which rapidly spread into the heart of the Council and was echoed in the columns of the French daily Press. The following extracts demonstrate the bitterness of the struggle and the capital importance of the stakes.

On 14th October, 1965, *France-Soir* (whose director is P. Lazareff) launched the campaign with the following paragraph, under the heading: "Anti-Semitic tracts distributed at the Council".

"A tract signed 'Leon de Poncins' of anti-Semitic inspiration and drawn up in French has been sent to quite a number of the Council Fathers. On Thursday and Friday the Council is due to take a final vote on the text of relations with non-Christians and in particular with the Jews."

On 15th October, Abbé Laurentin wrote several columns on the vote in *Le Figaro* under the heading: "The Jews and Deicide: An inextricable vote." In it he said:

Rome, 14th October. "The vote on the question of the Jews and deicide has dominated the Council for the past eight days. The first poll took place this morning and the result will not be known until tomorrow.

"But it is a burning, complex question. There has been a spate of propaganda. Three vigorously anti-Semitic documents have been liberally distributed to the Fathers, in the following order:

"1. The first is a pamphlet by Leon de Poncins, printed in Italian—*Le Probleme des Juifs au Concile*. This is his thesis—"The text on the Jews voted on last year is the work of progressive or ignorant bishops who have ratified the themes of judaic hatred of the Christians. The Sovereign Pontiff refused to ratify it for this reason. This accounts for the profound modifications brought into the new text, the object of today's ballot."

"2. The second pamphlet, also printed in Italian, is the work of Edoardo di Zaga. His thesis is that 'the declaration in favour of the Hebrews favours pro-Semite racism, and attacks the legitimate right of Christians and all peoples to defend themselves against the danger of Jewish hegemony.'

"3. Finally, they received two days ago directions for voting from *Coetus internationalis patrum*, the organ of the conciliar minority who are demanding the *non placet* on the whole of the schema and on the burning question concerning the Jews. Mgr. Carli, Bishop of Segni, one of its three signatories and directors, had published, in February 1965 in *Palestra del Clero*, the great review of the Italian clergy, a long article which maintained the following thesis: 'The Jewish people at the time of Jesus, as understood in the religious sense, that is to say, as a group professing the religion of Moses, was jointly responsible for the crime of deicide. Although only the leaders, followed by a small number

of the people, materially consummated the offence, Judaism of subsequent times shares objectively in the responsibility of the deicide'."

Abbé Laurentin then devoted several columns to the modifications introduced into the schema between 1964 and 1965. According to him, the Fathers of a progressive tendency sharply regretted the reductions in the text of the previous year, and he concluded: "As is evident, the situation is full of ambiguities. On the one hand, the cardinal has acceded to the principal requests, either from Arab circles or from the group whose spokesman, Mgr. Carli, has expressed views hostile to the Jews. On the other hand, he firmly asserts that the intention and sense of the text remains unchanged. It would be difficult to deny that there has been a split between the dual purpose of the cardinal and of his secretariat. Nor could one deny that in the situation in which they found themselves, it was almost impossible to resolve this distortion. The problem confronting the Fathers was in a certain sense inextricable."

On 17th October the news of the Council vote occupied the front page of *Le Monde*, and the whole of an interior page, and the following is an extract:

FINALLY ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL

The Declaration on the Jews evokes satisfaction, though not without reserves.

"The declaration on the Jews included in the schema on non-Christian religions was finally adopted on Wednesday by the Council. As *Le Monde* announced in its latest issue yesterday, the ballot on the text, in which 2,023 Fathers took part, produced the following results: 1,763 *placet*, 250 *non placet*, and 10 abstentions.

"Israeli circles and the American Jewish Committee—as well as Christian circles attached to the cause of reconciliation with the Jews—express satisfaction, tempered with regret that the text was finally sweetened, in several respects. On the other hand, the Grand Rabbi Kaplan deplored the fact that the term 'deicide' as applied to the Jews was not explicitly condemned.

"However, the majority of the reactions are that, now that the text has been adopted—and it still has to be promulgated by the Pope, it will be judged by its fruit, that is to say, by the way in which it is translated into religious teaching and by the attitude of Catholic circles with regard to the Jews.

"No reaction had yet been received by late Saturday morning

from the Arab countries, with the exception of a criticism from the orthodox Patriarch of Antioch."

From our special correspondent
HENRI FESQUET

Rome, 16th October. "The vote on the declaration on the Jews brings to an end the incredible number of advances, visits, letters, tracts, pamphlets and pressures with which the secretariat for unity has been assailed for more than three years. When the full details of the various attempts to frustrate or minimise the significance of the conciliar declaration become known, people will be amazed at so much passion, aberration, hatred and, in a word, ignorance and stupidity.

"On the other hand, several will regret with good cause that the last version of the text presented by the secretariat for unity had lost a little of its bite. It is especially sad that the real reasons for which these modifications were made have been more or less concealed behind pious motives. Roman diplomacy has once again triumphed over complete frankness. Many Fathers have said as much.

"But we must remember that the declaration, such as it was when voted upon, did rescue the essentials. The observers at the intersession who spread the most alarming rumours were heavily deceived. Vatican II has achieved the wish of John XXIII *grosso modo* by severely censuring anti-Semitism. The Church has implicitly recognised her past faults in the matter, and they are heavy, lasting and numerous. The new ecumenical mentality has overcome the prejudices of former times. In this connection, the vote on Friday inaugurates a fresh page in the history of relations between Rome and the Jews.

"Up to the last day the Catholic anti-Semites worked together in an attempt to muzzle the council. We have already drawn attention to the pamphlet in Italian by Mr. di Zaga. Another, from the pen of a Frenchman, Leon de Poncins, accuses the bishops who approved of the text last year of being 'ignorant (of the nature of their actions)'.

"A declaration worthy of an anti-Pope.

"But mention must above all be made of the four page tract which the bishops received. It is preceded by a paragraph as long as it is curious: 'No council, nor any Pope, can condemn Jesus, the Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church, her pontiffs (the tract lists fifteen 'anti-Semitic' Popes, from Nicholas I in the ninth century to Leo XIII), and her illustrious councils. But the declara-

tion on the Jews implicitly contains such a condemnation, and for this very good reason it should be rejected'."

On 22nd October, a long article filled almost the whole of the front page of the daily evening paper, *Paris-Presse*. It was much more objective than those in *Le Figaro* and above all of *Le Monde*, and despite its length we have quoted considerable extracts. The author of the article was well informed, since in fact the Holy Father did promulgate the schema on non-Christian religions (without change) on October 28th, although the date had been previously fixed for the end of November.

We quote *Paris-Presse*:

THE AFFAIR OF THE ANTI-JEWISH TRACTS AT THE COUNCIL

compels the Pope to promulgate the schema on non-Christian religions sooner than foreseen.

A violent corridor campaign aimed at Cardinal Bea.

(From our special correspondent, Charles Reymondon)

Vatican City, 21st October

"The Pope has decided to promulgate on 28th October the schema on non-Christian religions, that is to say, the schema which deals essentially with relations between the Jews and the Church.

"He intends thus to put an end to an anti-Semitic campaign which had acquired extraordinary volume in the heart of the Council, and which was accompanied by grave insinuations against Cardinal Bea.

"It is an event of considerable significance and has shaken this week at the Council, which in principle is committed to silence and to the work of the commissions alone.

"Last Friday, Pope Paul had announced that only four texts would be promulgated before All Saints day. But on the same day the vote on the most controversial schema of all, the one in question, took place. It revealed a strong enough minority, absolutely opposed to the schema: 250 fathers, 245 of whom totally refused the passage on the Jews, without there being any question of modifying or replacing it.

[Thus the opposition was much stronger in 1965 than in 1964 since, despite the indisputable improvement in the text, the number opposing it rose from 99 to 250—*Author's note*.]

"As in previous sessions no document had been promulgated with more than 10 per cent opposing, nobody believed on Friday,

or even on Saturday, that the 'declaration on non-Christian religions' would be promulgated before November 18th at the earliest.

"Yet on Sunday, from his window overlooking St. Peter's Square, the Pope precipitated things.

"Why?

Unacceptable terms

"It is probable that a new element moved the sovereign pontiff. One should not try to find the explanation from the list of his visitors between times. Whether Paul VI was influenced or not, it is highly likely that he had become anxious at possible backwash, and that, by a swift stroke of authority, such as is his custom, he meant to put an end to campaigns of opinion that were dangerous while he equivocated.

"The critics of the actual project of the declaration on the Jews are strong. On the one hand there is the objection raised by the Arab world: that Jewish political intentions are behind this move (which is why chapters were finally added to the text, to balance it, on Islam, then on Buddhism, and then, yet again, on all other religions). The Eastern patriarchs had spoken unanimously last year: 'We don't even want to talk about this declaration; its terms are quite unacceptable to us.' Through diplomatic channels, the Arab states had threatened the Pope most clearly with reprisals against the Eastern churches, their missions and their schools. President Soekarno, representing the Moslem governments, had visited the Pope and told him the same thing. Finally, the Pope had received letters from Eastern Catholic hierarchies which informed him of the scandalised reaction of their flocks. They foreshadowed the risk of a schism on the part of these Churches to whom fidelity to Rome has already proved so costly in history.

Minority

"By contrast with the opposition from the East, which is explained by motives of expediency or political justice, the accusations arising from the rest of Christianity are much more serious, even though they are only representative of a small minority.

"They are based, indeed, in a much more disturbing manner, on the doctrinal level. They claim to demonstrate, by reference to authorities and documents, that there is an ignominious contradiction between what the Council proposes to say about the Jews, and holy scripture, the fathers of the Church, preceding Councils and some of the most eminent popes.

"But they go much further. Less and less indirectly, they are insinuating against Cardinal Bea, who is principally responsible for the text, the suspicion of simony. Simony is one of the gravest

crimes which have poisoned the history of the Church, and one which the Pope recently told the correspondent of *Corriere della Sera* had completely disappeared today. The word comes from the Acts of the Apostles, where it is written how Simon the Magician offered money to St. Peter in order to receive spiritual powers from him. To be guilty of simony is to traffic in holy things: the sacraments, nominations to ecclesiastical positions, or the transformation of doctrine itself, all for a sum of money.

"Now, Cardinal Bea is accused of having accepted Jewish capital for the functions of his secretariat for unity. (The journeys necessitated by relations with the Orthodox and the Protestants are obviously costly.) He is accused of having imprudently promised, *per contra*, a declaration which would, as far as it concerns the Church, be the epilogue to the Nuremberg trial: that she should demand pardon from the Jews for all the persecutions which Christian doctrine has caused them throughout the centuries (deicide Jews, the people accursed by God, etc.).

"That denunciation is without proof. It is probable that if the Cardinal published his accounts, and the sources, that there would be silence at once. But it is inconceivable that a man in such an elevated position should lower himself to such a dispute.

"But the following extract, which is taken from a tract in Spanish circulated in the corridors of the Council, will give one an idea of the violence of the accusations which originated two years ago in a Latin-American country:

" 'We are ready to take the necessary steps to save the Church from such an ignominy. We appeal to the Council Fathers who have not yielded to Jewish pressure, or who have not sold themselves in simony to Jewish gold . . . to repel the perfidious declaration. . . . '

"The document is signed by twenty-eight organisations from the United States, Spain, France, Portugal, Germany, Austria and six Latin-American countries. Jordan and Italy. However, several leaders of these organisations, notably four out of five of the French, denied within the first twenty-four hours that they were signatories.

[In their issue of 21st October, *Le Monde*, which had already drawn attention to this document, announced that it was spurious, at least as far as the signatures were concerned—*Author's note.*]

"The whole affair constitutes an incredible hornet's nest. It is impossible here to get to the bottom of the thrilling, luminous and terrible 'Jewish question', for history has coloured its blood red. This part of the record can only serve to give an idea of the

importance which the present decision of the Pope carries: throwing all his authority into the scales, he is free to modify the text himself before his final decision, in order to rally the opposition, a possibility which may not be ruled out."

We will now compare the 1964 and 1965 texts and examine the essential points of the schema, which are: the question of deicide, the collective responsibility of the Jewish people for the death of Christ, and anti-Semitism and persecution.

The 1964 text "deplored and condemned hatred and maltreatment (*vexationem*) of Jews", but the 1965 and final text "condemns all persecutions of any men" and "deplores manifestations of anti-Semitism".

These are the actual words of the latter text:

"The Church condemns all persecutions of any men; she remembers her common heritage with the Jews and, acting not from any political motives, but rather from a spiritual and evangelical love, deplores all hatred, persecutions and other manifestations of anti-Semitism, whatever the period and whoever was responsible."

(*De Ecclesiae*: Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, Tr. by T. Atthill, C.T.S., 1966, p. 7)

The 1964 text was very dangerous—unacceptable, according to the conservatives—when examined in the light of Jewish demands, whose spokesman was Jules Isaac.

It put the Church in the position of the accused, guilty of the permanent, unjustifiable and unattonable crime of anti-Semitism for two thousand years.

It questioned the good faith and truthfulness of the Evangelists, of St. John and St. Matthew in particular; it discredited the teaching of the Fathers of the Church and of the great doctrinarians of the papacy by depicting them in distasteful colours; in short, it threatened to demolish the very bastions of Catholic doctrine.

We readily grant that the 1,651 Council Fathers who voted on this text were quite unaware of all that the vote implied, for a preliminary survey had convinced me that the vast majority of the Council Fathers had read none of the books of Jules Isaac, Joshua Jehouda and others whose demands, supported by the great world Jewish organisations—the B'nai B'rith, the World Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, the Alliance Israelite Universelle—formed the basis of the schema submitted to them. The whole affair had been hatched in semi secrecy and with supreme skill by Cardinal Bea, Jules Isaac and a small group of progressives and Jewish

leaders,¹ whose antagonism to traditional Christianity was veiled under appearances of Christian charity, ecumenical unity, and common biblical relationship. We have revealed the manoeuvre in the first chapters of this book, and will not repeat it here, except to remark that it came very near to succeeding. In fact, it had already succeeded; but the Pope opposed it, in extremis, refused to promulgate the 1964 vote, and sent the text back to the commission to work on.

Let us return to the 1965 text, which formulates the official doctrine of the Church. What was the reaction of the Arab countries? They had reacted extremely violently to the 1964 text. In the course of an interview with *Le Figaro*, published in their issue of October 25th, the patriarch Maximos IV, who is himself of Arab origin, revealed their reaction to the 1965 text:

"Maximos IV being Arab himself, I asked him: 'What is the reaction of the Arab countries to the Council's declaration on the Jews?'"

This was his reply:

"In view of the notable amendments introduced into the new text of the declaration, the reaction of the Arab countries was semi-neutral this time. The new amendments will prevent political exploitation in favour of universal Zionism and the State of Israel, for it is now a purely religious text.

"Anti-Semitism is not Arabic for the Arabs are Semites. The unfavourable and often violent reaction of Zionist propaganda to the publication of the new text proves that Zionist circles are seeking something other than an appeal to forget the past and to universal charity. They wanted a declaration of a political tendency. And that the Council was bound to refuse them. As for the rest, we are the first to invite Christian charity among all peoples without distinction of race or religion. But Christian justice equally obliges us to claim the rights of the oppressed, the robbed and the refugees unjustly driven from their homes and reduced to living on international charity. If we reprove persecutions against the Jews, we must equally reprove persecutions and injustices done by the Jews."

[Several hundred thousand Arabs were brutally driven out of

¹ According to Fr. Weigel, S.J., professor of ecclesiastical history at Woodstock College, Maryland, who is on the staff of the review *America*, the declaration condemning anti-Semitism which was accepted by Cardinal Bea in 1964, was suggested by Zachariah Schuster, President of the American Jewish Committee.

Palestine by the Israeli Government, where they had been living for centuries, and they have been living in misery ever since in refugee camps—Author's note.]

"Thus since the Council text can no longer be used for political ends in favour of Zionism, the opposition of the Moslem peoples no longer has any basis."

Passing from the content matter of the various texts, we now come to the question of deicide.

An early text, elaborated in 1963, declared that it is an error and an injustice (*injuria*) to describe the Jewish people as deicide.

The 1965 text suppressed this clause. the question of deicide was withdrawn from discussion and the Church remains at the status quo.

In February 1965, Mgr. Carli ended a long article on this subject, published in the Italian review *Palestra del Clero* (15th February), with the following passage:

"We must now draw a general conclusion from the preceding biblical excursus. It seems to me that it may be summed up thus: for textual as well as for authoritarian reasons, the thesis according to which Judaism should be considered as responsible for deicide, and reproved and accursed by God, in the meaning and within the limits outlined above, is still legitimately defensible or at least legitimately probable.

"For this reason, a prohibition by the Council tending to put an end to free discussion one way or the other seems to me inopportune. Indeed, it would be more in harmony with the nature of the Council and with the practice adopted with regard to other schemas to leave it to the study and discussion of theologians and exegetes. . . .

"In any event, customary charity and Christian prudence ought to dictate the most suitable means and occasion for announcing a truth which, although displeasing—as one may well understand—to the parties concerned, does not merit for that reason alone to be consigned to absolute silence if, as many consider, it is effectively to be found in the deposit of divine Revelation."

Thus Mgr. Carli's conclusion was accepted by the conciliar commission when it withdrew the discussion on the motion of deicide.

This decision aroused the wrath of the Grand Rabbi, Joseph Kaplan. Interviewed by "Europe 1", he said:

"I want it to be recognised that in 1965 the word deicide has no meaning and that furthermore it has an odious resonance. But precisely by reason of all the harm which this false accusation has

done to the Jews for seventeen centuries, the schema should have clearly proclaimed that the accusation ought no longer to be brought against the Jews because it has no meaning and because it has an odious resonance. But the schema did not mention it. One can perceive the open determination of those who modified the text last year not to wash the Jews of the accusation of deicide and that is extremely serious."

(Reproduced by *Le Monde*, 17th October 1965)

Likewise, the Chief Rabbi of Rome, Elio Toaff, violently protested on 4th April 1965, when the Pope delivered a homily on the Passion, in the course of which he said:

"It is an extremely solemn and sad page which recalls for us the meeting between Jesus and the Jewish people. This people was predestined to receive the Messiah and had been waiting for him for thousands of years and was completely absorbed in this hope and certitude, but at the very moment, that is to say when Christ came and spoke and showed himself, not only did they not recognise him, but fought him, slandered him, abused him and finally put him to death."

(*Osservatore Romano*, 7th April 1965)

Dr. Toaff and Dr. Sergio Piperno, President of the Union of Italian Jewish communities, sent the following telegram to the Vatican:

"Italian Jews express their sorrowful amazement at charge Hebrew people in death of Jesus contained in Sovereign Pontiff's homily, delivered shortly before Easter Roman parish Our Lady of Guadalupe and reported official Vatican Press, thus renewing deicide accusation, secular source tragic injustices towards Jews, to which solemn affirmations Vatican Council seemed to terminate for ever."

(*Il Messaggero de Roma*, 8th April 1965)

The 1964 text practically absolved the Jews of all responsibility for the death of Christ. The 1965 text formally recognises the responsibility of the Jewish leaders and their followers for the death of Christ but does not extend this responsibility to the whole Jewish people living in Christ's time, still less to the Jewish people of today.

The following is the relevant passage from the text concerning the collective responsibility of Israel:

"Even if the Jewish authorities, together with their followers, urged the death of Christ (cf. John xix. 6), what was done to him in his passion cannot be blamed on all Jews living at that time indiscriminately, or on the Jews of today. Although the

Church is the new People of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected by God or accursed, as though this followed from Scripture. Therefore all must take care that in instruction and in preaching the Word of God, they do not teach anything which is not in complete agreement with the truth of the gospel and the spirit of Christ."

(*De Ecclesiae*, *ibid.*, pp. 6-7)

In the final version, therefore, in 1965, the Council did not follow Jules Isaac on this point, for Jules Isaac denies the responsibility of the leaders of Judaism and throws it all upon the Romans, but it yields on another point by absolving the Jewish people of any responsibility for the decision of their leaders.

The 1965 motion before the Council absolutely conforms with historical truth such as it appears from the accounts of the Evangelists—it is the leaders of Judaism and their followers who are responsible for the death of Christ. Strictly speaking, one can say that the whole of the Jewish people was not consulted and does not carry the direct responsibility for it, but the question of collective responsibility is very complex.

In fact, the decisions of leaders always involve the collective responsibility of peoples, even if the latter have taken no part in the decision, and in the last resort it is the peoples who undergo its consequences. History is full of examples of this sort. Take the last war, for example. Hitler's leaders did not consult the German people as far as the outbreak and conduct of the war is concerned, but it led finally to murderous bombardments, the destruction of whole towns, the invasion of their country, the violation of millions of their women, massive deportations and millions of deaths. Similarly, Churchill did not consult the British people before involving his country in war with Germany.

Do the legal principles accepted by the Western peoples recognise collective responsibility in law? Yes, to a certain extent they do, if one is to judge by the Nuremberg trial.

As far as Judaism is concerned, the Council's decision raises thorny problems: numerous and eminent doctors of the Church, for example, have upheld the principle of the collective responsibility of Israel. On this point, in the course of two resounding articles which he devoted to the Jewish problem in the Italian review *Palestra del Clero* (15th February and 1st May 1965), Mgr. Carli quoted some striking authorities, and concluded one of the articles with these words:

"Can one call the Jews deicide?"

"It has been said that one ought not to speak of 'deicide' be-

cause, according to etymology, God cannot be put to death. But it is easy to reply that the murder of Jesus Christ, the true son of God, merits the name of deicide in strict (exact) theological terminology.

"The real question is whether the whole Jewish 'people' should be considered as guilty of 'deicide'. The 1964 declaration says no in an indisputable fashion.

"However, the numerous scholars and exegetes who clearly find evidence in the Old Testament—despite Ezekiel xvii—of the principle of 'collective responsibility' for good as well as for evil, seem to me to be right. The whole history of Israel is woven on a doubly polarized canvas: on the one hand, there is God with his collective gifts and punishments, and on the other, there is the 'chosen people' which accepts or refuses. The whole people is considered responsible and subsequently punished for faults officially committed by its leaders, even when they are unknown to a great part of the people.

"Examples of such an attitude may be found in the New Testament"—Mgr. Carli quotes a great number of extremely striking passages, which unfortunately we have not the space to reproduce here—and then goes on to add:

"Without the doctrine of collective responsibility all this would remain in undecipherable mystery.

"To conclude, I consider that one can legitimately assert that the whole Jewish people at the time of Jesus, as understood in the religious sense, that is to say, as a group professing the religion of Moses, was jointly responsible for the crime of deicide, although only the leaders, followed by a small number of the faithful, materially consummated the crime.

"These leaders were not, of course, elected democratically by universal suffrage, but according to the legislation and attitude of mind then in force, they were considered by God himself (cf. Matthew xxiii. 2) and by public opinion, as the legitimate religious authorities, the officials responsible for the acts which they took in the name of religion itself. But it is precisely by these leaders that Jesus Christ was condemned to death: and he was condemned precisely because he claimed to be God (John x. 33; xix. 7), and yet he had given sufficient proof to be believed (John xv. 24).

"The sentence of condemnation was taken by the Council (John xi. 49 et seq.), that is to say, by the highest authority of the Jewish religion, appealing to the Law of Moses (John xix. 7), and laying the motive for the sentence upon an action in defence of the whole people (John xi. 50) and of religion itself (Matthew

xxvi. 65). It was the priesthood of Aaron, the synthesis and principal expression of the theocratic and hierocratic policy of the Old Testament, which condemned the Messiah. Consequently, one may attribute deicide to Judaism, when considered as a religious community.

"Within this very limited meaning, and bearing in mind biblical mentality, Judaism of the times after Our Lord also objectively shares the collective responsibility for deicide in as far as this Judaism constitutes the free and voluntary continuation of Judaism at that time.

"An example taken from the Church will help us to understand this fact. Each time that a Sovereign Pontiff and an ecumenical Council take a solemn deliberation in the plenitude of their authority, although they are not elected by the catholic community on a democratic system, yet by this decision they render co-responsible now and for all centuries to come, all 'catholicism' and the whole community of the faithful."

(*Palestra del Clero*, 1st February 1965)

Let us take the most celebrated of the numerous texts implying the collective responsibility of Israel, the Gospel of St. Matthew.

By Judas' treason, Jesus was delivered to the chief priests and they "took council against Jesus to put him to death." Finally:

"When they had bound him they led him away and delivered him to Pontius Pilate . . . and the governor asked him, saying: 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' And Jesus said unto him: Thou sayest. And when he was accused of the chief priests and elders he answered nothing. Then said Pilate unto him: 'Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee?' And he answered to him never a word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly. Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would. And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas. Therefore, when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them: Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ? For he knew that for envy they had delivered him. When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him. But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas and destroy Jesus. The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas. Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ? They all say unto him, Let him be

crucified. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified. When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing but that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it. Then answered all the people and said, His blood be on us and on our children. Then released he Barabbas unto them and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified."

(Matthew xxvii.)

This Gospel formally implies the collective responsibility of the Jewish people for the death of Jesus.

What attitude will the Church adopt on this point after the last Council, and how does one reconcile the above passage with the 1965 schema?

Will the Church admit to the thesis of Jules Isaac, which asserts that St. Matthew is a liar, that he falsified historical truth and completely invented this dramatic scene solely in order to reproach the Jews, St. Matthew, who was of their race?

Or will the Church, on the contrary, uphold and defend the historical truth of the Gospels?

The Council and the Holy Father have already taken their decision. They have vigorously re-asserted the truth of the Gospels.

"An inextricable vote," wrote Abbé Laurentin in *Le Figaro*, speaking about the Jewish question at the Council. "An incredible hornet's nest," as *Paris-Presse* described it in an article from which we have quoted at length. Cardinal Tappouni, Patriarch of the Catholic Churches of the Oriental Rite, told me at Rome at the time of the conciliar discussions: "We Fathers of the Oriental Church have clearly taken our position. We have declared once and for all that any discussion of the Jewish problem was inopportune. I have nothing to add or retract from this declaration for a word too many or too few on such a neuralgic problem could lead to disaster. The facts have proved us right, and no good will come out of it either for the Christians or the Jews."

Cardinal Tappouni was probably right but in fact the question has been raised and it can no longer be eluded. It has already caused quite a stir throughout the world, as Mgr. Carli remarks in his articles:

"The declaration on non-Christian religions . . . has unleashed an indignant Press campaign, it has provoked political and diplomatic complications and, unfortunately, in the East it has pro-

vided an excuse for some to abandon Catholicism in favour of Orthodoxy. The Fathers who support it are slandered with having sold themselves to international Jewry, whereas those who, for various reasons, consider the declaration inopportune or at least want to see it modified, are labelled anti-Zionists and practically held co-responsible for the Nazi camps."

Jules Isaac protests violently in his works against the principle of the collective responsibility of Israel, and Rabbi Kaplan echoes him.

But on the subject of collective responsibility, the Jews place themselves in a false position which renders them very vulnerable. *They furiously repulse any suggestion of collective responsibility when they themselves risk being found guilty of it but vehemently insist on it when it is to their advantage to do so.*

In chapter ten of this work we have quoted a typical article by Vladimir Jankélévitch, an important personality in Israel. In *Le Monde*, 3rd January 1965, speaking of Hitler's Jewish victims, he wrote:

"This crime without name is a crime that is truly infinite . . . of which one is compelled to say that only Germanic sadism could be guilty. . . . The methodical, scientific and administrative massacre of six million Jews is not a wrong *per se*, it is a crime for which a whole people is accountable."

Indeed, the German people was declared collectively responsible at Nuremberg for Hitler's anti-Jewish measures and every taxpayer in Federal Germany (except those in Eastern Germany under the Soviet régime) pays considerable sums every year to the State of Israel by way of indemnification for the wrongs undergone by international Judaism at the hands of Hitler.

But one cannot refuse the principle of collective responsibility when it is not to one's advantage and claim it when it is. One must choose one way or the other. If this principle is not admitted, and it would seem that the Council opted in favour of the negative, it is hard to see why Israel continues to exact a heavy tribute from the German people. Similarly, in this light the Nuremberg trial loses part of its justification.

An inextricable vote. An incredible hornet's nest.

There is a third point on which it is to be hoped that the Church will clarify her position following the Council vote, for it is susceptible of very different interpretations and has formidable consequences; the problem of anti-Semitism and persecution. It is a prob-

lem which has arisen in every country in the past three thousand years in which an appreciable number of Jews have resided.

This is what the schema adopted by the Council says:

"The Church condemns all persecutions of any men; she remembers her common heritage with the Jews and, acting not from any political motives, but rather from a spiritual and evangelical love, deplores all hatred, persecutions and other manifestations of anti-Semitism, whatever the period and whoever was responsible."

(*De Ecclesiae*, *ibid.*, p. 7)

It is a text which looks short, simple and irrefutable, one on which agreement ought to be unanimous; the Church has always reproved persecution, and here the whole world will agree with her.

It is however bristling with difficulties and complex problems, and it is very much to be hoped that the Church will explain what will be her position henceforth.

Anti-Semitism and persecution are words liable to provoke emotional outbursts.

Let us begin with anti-Semitism. What exactly are manifestations of anti-Semitism? The ideas of anti-Semitism vary entirely according as to whether one examines them from the Jewish point of view or from the point of view of the non-Jews.

In Jewish eyes, every measure of defence and protection against the penetration of Jewish ideas and conceptions, against anti-Christian Jewish heresies, against Jewish control of the national economy, and in general every measure in defence of national Christian traditions, is a manifestation of anti-Semitism. Furthermore, many Jews consider that the very fact of the recognition of the existence of a Jewish question constitutes a declaration of anti-Semitism. "Their ideal", says Wickham Steed, in his remarkable work, *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, "seems to be the maintenance of Jewish international influence as a veritable *imperium in imperiis*. Dissimulation of their real objects has become to them a second nature, and they deplore and tenaciously combat every effort to place the Jewish question frankly on its merits before the world." (p. 179)

Let us take the concrete example concerning the Church. Jules Isaac, as we have abundantly shown at the beginning of this work, Jules Isaac accuses all the Fathers of the Church of anti-Semitism, St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustin, St. Agobard, the celebrated Pope St. Gregory the Great, etc. He treats them as perverters of the truth and torturers for their attitude towards Judaism. He accuses them of having unleashed the savagery of the beast and of being the real people responsible for German anti-Semitism and the gas chambers

at Auschwitz. He finds them even worse than Hitler and Streicher and others, for their system resulted in the Jews being tortured slowly and being left to live and suffer interminably.

"Henceforward we perceive the radical difference which separates the Christian system of vilification from its modern Nazi imitator—blind and ignorant are they who ignore their thousand profound connections: the latter was only a stage, a brief stage preceding the massive extermination; the former on the contrary involved survival, but a shameful survival in contempt and disgrace; thus it was created to endure and to injure and slowly torture millions of innocent victims."

(J. Isaac: *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, pp. 168-72)

What will the attitude of the post-conciliar Church be on this point? What is the meaning of the phrase: "deplores all manifestations of anti-Semitism, whatever the period and whoever may have been responsible"?

Does the Church admit Jules Isaac's thesis and plead guilty?

Must Masses be said for the repose of the soul and pardon of the sins of St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustin, St. Gregory the Great and other great saints in the Christian liturgy, guilty of the crime of anti-Semitism?

Must their teaching be rectified and purified, according to the injunctions of Jules Isaac?

Must the Gospels be purged of many a passage which bears the taint of anti-Semitism?

"Can one," writes Mgr. Carli, "Can one legitimately make the Catholic Church, as such, assume such an enormous responsibility which would make of her the cruellest and vastest association of evil-doers that has ever existed on the face of the earth? The Jews today no longer want to be considered responsible for everything which was done to Jesus Christ by their ancestors, to whom even now they grant the benefit of good faith; but they demand that the Catholic Church of today should feel responsible and guilty for everything which, according to them, the Jews have suffered for the past two thousand years."

"I do not think that the Church, even out of charity or humility alone, can officially adopt such an interpretation of history. At least she ought not to accuse herself of such a transgression, which soils her image before her sons and the whole world, until after a minute and impartial investigation for which the few lines of the conciliar schema naturally cannot suffice (quite apart from their conclusive value).

"Nobody means to deny by this, and all the world is ready to regret, that there have arisen, to a greater or lesser degree, through ignorance and sometimes through bad faith, prejudiced anti-Jewish Christians; in the same way that certain Jewish rabbinical literature insulted Jesus and the Holy Virgin Mary, and inspired hatred and cursing against the Christians.

"But, rather than engaging in historical proceedings and demanding each other to admit to guilt, it would be much more useful for each to formulate exact doctrinal principles and to practise esteem and charity, and so to bring down mutual prejudices. In this sense one can subscribe to the words of the Chief Rabbi of Denmark: 'We will probably continue to remain a sign of mutual contradiction, but we will no longer devour each other.'

(cf. *Oikoumenikon*, 1st August, 1963, p. 270)

"But on condition that 'we deny none of our principles. For us Catholics, without denying or passing in silence over any of the points contained in Holy Scripture or in the divine, apostolic tradition.'

"Let us then work out a text which will be acceptable 'to all our Jewish friends', but which will above all be acceptable to all who love objective truth. . . .

"Were two thousand years of history so filled, as the Jewish thesis has it, with the moral faults of the Church towards the people of Israel, it cannot and ought not to change the terms of the question, as expressed on the lips of Jesus, St. Peter, St. Paul, etc. . . .

"The decision carried in the 1964 schema coincided with what the Jews propose and hope for. May I be permitted to doubt that it is acceptable according to objective truth."

(Mgr. Carli: *Palestro del Clero*, 1st May 1965)

What is the attitude of the Church towards persecution?—a term which the Jews always associate with the word anti-Semitism.

The Church reproves all forms of persecution from whatever side they come. Once again everybody will be in agreement, provided that the phrase "whatever the period and whoever may have been responsible" is clarified.

To hear and read Jewish authors, one would believe that only they are the victims of persecution in the world. In the modern world only anti-Jewish persecution arouses the democratic conscience. There are many victims of persecution in the history of the world, and they are not only Jewish.

In the review *Palestra del Clero*, 15th February 1965, Mgr. Carli wrote very justly:

"Certainly, no one ought to condemn hatred and persecution more than a Catholic, especially when their pretext is religious or racial motives. But it does seem peculiar, to some, to say the least, that in a conciliar document only those wrongs suffered by the Jews 'either in previous times or in our own days' are expressly condemned, as if others had not existed and do not, unfortunately, still exist today no less worthy of explicit condemnation. We refer to the massacre of the Armenians, and to the genocides and innumerable killings perpetrated under the banner of Marxist Communism", and Mgr. Carli added:

"With regard to the persecution of the Jews, certainly neither the Roman emperor Claudius, nor the German leader Hitler, to take only the first and the last of anti-Semitic persecutors in the Christian era, took their inspiration from religious principles."

Finally, since we are concerned with persecution, we must also mention those for which Jewish people are responsible, for they, who always set themselves up as innocent, crucified victims, are terrible persecutors when they have the upper hand. This subject is dealt with in chapter ten of this work, and we will not repeat again what we have said there.

In a work written in 1921 called *Le Problème Juif*, George Batault said:

"The attitude adopted by many Jews in attributing the secular phenomenon of anti-Semitism uniquely to the basest sentiments and to the crassest ignorance is absolutely untenable. It is perfectly infantile perpetually to seek to contrast the good Jewish sheep, steeped in pious meekness, with the bad non-Jewish wolf, thirsting for blood and howling with ferocious jealousy. The philosophy of history which consists in describing as a pogromist anyone who attempts to tackle the Jewish problem in a spirit which is not deliriously apologetic, this philosophy must be abandoned."

(G. Batault: *Le Problème Juif*, Paris 1921)

The following experience is a recent example of this state of mind. In October 1965 I went to Rome and delivered to more than two thousand Council Fathers, as well as a certain number of eminent personalities, a pamphlet entitled *Le Problème Juif face au Concile*, two-thirds of which were printed in Italian and the remainder in French. It contained a brief history of the role of Jules Isaac in the preparation of the conciliar schema on the Jewish question and

a summary of the theses of his and other masters of contemporary Jewish thought on the question of the relations between Judaism and Christianity. It was neither abusive nor insulting, being simply an exposé of texts which I confined myself to presenting in a clear and coherent fashion. For I considered that it was essential for the Council Fathers to have a knowledge of these texts, since they formed the very basis on which the Fathers had been called to vote. A preliminary enquiry had rapidly convinced me that practically all the Council Fathers were completely unaware both of the existence of the texts and of the importance of the role of Jules Isaac.

In contrast with Jules Isaac, H. Fesquet of *Le Monde* and other laymen who exerted great influence at the Council, I did not issue any advice or directives, but simply put forward some information, adding: "The decision now rests with the Council Fathers and it is they who will carry the responsibility for it."

Several big papers in France, led by *Le Monde*, drew attention to my intervention and to the distribution of my pamphlets. All accused me, in rather disagreeable phraseology, of "anti-Semitism". In their issue of 17th October, speaking of "the incredible number of advances, visits, letters, tracts, pamphlets and pressures with which the secretariat for unity had been assailed (on the declaration on the Jews)", *Le Monde* said, "people will be amazed at so much passion, aberration, hatred and in a word, ignorance and stupidity".

Since my name was clearly mentioned a little further on in the article, this criticism was obviously directed at me, a criticism in which, naturally, passion, hatred, ignorance and stupidity played no part.

One of my relations sent my pamphlet to a priest whom I did not know, who is headmaster of a Catholic school and a renowned preacher, and received this letter in reply:

"I enclose the distressing pamphlet by Mr. de Poncins, which shows so little pity towards Israel, so little charity and such a narrow interpretation of history. These eternal snippets from Joshua Jehouda are very irritating. Does Mr. de Poncins imagine that Mgr. de Provençères and the Council Fathers are unaware that the Jews and the Moslems fiercely reject the Incarnation? Is that what it is all about?"

"When the Council's text appears in the Press, you will see. It is in a word the work of Cardinal Bea, a Jesuit and an exegete of eighty years who is greatly travelled and read and who undoubtedly has a great love of men and a great sense of justice. It is this motive, and not ignorance, which impelled him to sup-

port the schema, and upon which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, some two thousand Catholic bishops will vote."

Thus in the eyes of this worthy priest it is not Jules Isaac and the others who are provoking by attacking the great doctrines of Christianity; no, it is I who am provoking since I have actually quoted them and made them known. But there is no doubt that the disclosure of these deadly texts was exceedingly embarrassing to the success of the Jewish progressive manoeuvre, and if they could have been published earlier they would have been even more effective.

The conclusion is very obvious: these "anti-Semites", who use a formidable weapon, the texts of Jewish authors themselves, must at all costs be silenced. This is what Abbé Laurentin said in scarcely veiled terms, when he wrote in *Le Figaro* on 15th October 1965:

"Is the 1965 text sufficient to tear out the roots of Christian anti-Semitism, which has expressed itself so vigorously these last months?"

In other words, one of the aims of the 1964 text was to impose silence on the "anti-Semites". However, though admirably prepared, the manoeuvre did not succeed, or only very partially, for the 1965 text leaves the way open for restricted possibilities in this field.

On the other hand, no restriction whatever impedes Jewish writers or their allies.

With impunity Jules Isaac can write large works, recently re-published, in which he describes the Evangelists as liars, the Fathers and the great saints of the Church as scurrilous pamphleteers, perverters of the truth and torturers, and in which he calls on the Church to recognise, abjure and make amends for her criminal wrongs towards the Jews. Bishops such as Mgr. de Provençères publicly express their esteem, respect and affection for him. Mgr. Gerlier, the cardinal archbishop of Lyon, writes a laudatory preface in a book by Abbé Toulat called *Juifs mes Frères*, in which the role of Jules Isaac is exalted and glorified. Mgr. Liénart, the cardinal archbishop of Lille, patronises Jules Isaac's own *Amitié judéo-chrétiennes*. But because I simply quote Jules Isaac, Joshua Jehouda and others, I am described as a despicable anti-Semite—a typical example of passion, aberration, hatred, ignorance and stupidity, if one is to believe *Le Monde*.

Finally, the progressive clergy reserves its favours for the enemies of religion and pours sarcasm, scorn and hostility on those who defend their own tradition.

As far as common biblical relationship with the Jewish people is

concerned, this indeed is indisputable, but we must beware of pushing the argument too far.

The New Testament marks a great turning-point in the history of religious thought and a profound break with the Old Testament. The split has only increased over the centuries.

The 1965 text says:

"This sacred council remembers the bond by which the people of the New Testament is spiritually linked to the line of Abraham. The Church of Christ recognises that in God's plan of salvation, the beginnings of her own election and faith are to be found in the Patriarchs, Moses and the Prophets. . . . The Church cannot, therefore, forget that it was through that people, with whom God in his ineffable mercy saw fit to establish the Old Covenant, that she herself has received the revelation of the Old Testament. She takes her nourishment from the root of the cultivated olive-tree on to which the wild-olive branches of the Gentiles have been grafted (cf. Romans xi. 17-24). The Church believes that Christ, who is our Peace, has reconciled Jews and Gentiles through the cross and has made us both one in himself (cf. Ephesians ii. 14-16). . . .

"Holy Scripture is witness that Jerusalem has not known the time of her visitation (cf. Luke xix. 44). The Jews have not, for the most part, accepted the Gospel; some indeed have opposed its diffusion (cf. Romans xi. 28). Even so, according to the Apostle Paul, the Jews still remain very dear to God, for the sake of their fathers, since he does not repent of the gifts he makes or the calls he issues (cf. Romans xi. 28-29). In company with the Prophets and the same Apostle, the Church looks forward to that day, known to God alone, when all peoples will call on the Lord with one voice and 'serve him with one shoulder'.

(Soph. iii. 9; cf. Isaiah lxvi. 23; Psalms lxxv. 4; Romans xi. 11-32)

"Given this great spiritual heritage common to Christians and Jews, it is the wish of this sacred Council to foster and recommend a mutual knowledge and esteem, which will come from biblical and theological studies, and brotherly discussions."

(*De Ecclesiae*, *ibid.*, pp. 5-6)

In his article in *Palestra del Clero*, Mgr. Carli clearly explains Catholic doctrine on this point:

"At a certain moment in history Israel broke the Covenant with God, not so much because it had transgressed the commandments of God, or in other words, because it had not fulfilled the con-

ditions of the Covenant (it had committed this sin so often and God had always forgiven it!) as because it had refused the fulfilment of the Covenant itself by refusing Jesus: 'for Christ is the fulfilment of the law' (Romans x, 4). Henceforth it was no longer a question of accidental terms of the Covenant, but of its actual substance. Automatically, Israel's 'election' was completely frustrated, it lost its purpose, and the privileges which were attached to it lost their sufficient reason. . . . Israel ended up by becoming institutionalised after a fashion into global, official and adamant opposition to Christ and his doctrine, despite the great 'sign' of the Resurrection of the Messiah.

"The mosaic religion which, by a disposition made known by God, was to issue into Christianity to find in it its own end and perfection, on the contrary constantly refused to adhere to Christ, thus 'rejecting' the cornerstone laid by God. It is not a question of the renunciation pure and simple of God's plan (which is already a very grave error), but of positive opposition; in this respect, the relationship between Christianity and Judaism is much worse than the relationship between Christianity and the other religions. For Israel alone had been chosen for and received a vocation, gifts and history, etc., very different from all other people on earth: in God's plan, Israel was entirely and completely 'relative' to Christ and Christianity. Having failed to achieve, through its own fault, such an important 'relativity', it had of itself put itself in a state of objective 'rejection'. This state will last as long as the Judaic religion throughout the world refuses to recognise and officially accept Jesus Christ.

"In my opinion, Holy Scripture justifies this interpretation and patristic tradition confirms it."

The rupture between the Old and the New Testament has continually increased as the Torah, or Law of Moses, made way for the growing influence of the Talmud as the source of inspiration of the Hebrew religion. The modern Jew studies not the Mosaic law but the Talmud; and between the Gospel and the Talmud there is an irreducible antagonism. We would but remind the reader that we have dealt with this question in chapter five of this work.

Will this antagonism endure until the end of time?

No, answers Catholic doctrine as formulated by St. Paul, for at the end of time, the whole Jewish people will be converted:

"At the end of time the mass of the Jews will save themselves; this assertion of St. Paul's is an essential part of Christian hope. . . . God's gifts are given absolutely, that is to say, once given they are never taken away; but for those who refuse them

or do not use them at the appropriate time, they turn into articles of condemnation. . . .

"This position was freely accepted by Israel, and as long as it persists the 'objective' state of accursedness remains with all its consequences. But one must categorically deny that any human authority whatever, whether private or public, may, under no matter what right or pretext, execute the punishment attached to the divine judgment: God alone may do it, in the manner and at the time he chooses."

(Mgr. Carli: *Palestra del Clero*, 15th February 1965)

But the masters of contemporary Judaism oppose this belief with haughty contempt and scorn. We have quoted particularly striking passages from Jehouda to illustrate this point. It is not the Jews who will convert to Christianity, which in their eyes is a bastard religion, a corrupted branch of Judaism—it is the Christians who must return to Israel. The following recent passage serves to confirm and strengthen this opinion:

"Let us be under no illusions: if they think they are going to exculpate us in order to win us more easily, they deceive themselves. We will not be changed. We must be accepted as we are—with our absolute and indivisible monotheism, with our fierce desire to survive as a distinct community, with our categorical refusal of every other 'truth'. We do not want to convert, we consider that we are adult men capable of choosing our own path ourselves. We want to be treated accordingly. But if your religion obliges you to proselytise, we do not object. Only, we warn you: you will be wasting your time. We will remain as we are, and no force on earth or in heaven will change us. For we are made from a substance as hard as the rock; we resisted God in our youth and men in our maturity. Thus we can wait. For this reason, the only attitude worthy of a Jew towards the ecumenical Council is one of polite impassiveness. Let us keep quiet and pursue our own work, waiting with serenity. For whatever the results may be, we must continue alone along our inconceivable route."

(Alexander Reiter, in an article on *Les Juifs et le Concile*, published by the weekly *Terre retrouvée* 15th June, 1964)

The conclusion may be drawn in a few words; it stems clearly from the numerous texts we have quoted from Jewish authors.

A religious agreement between Western Christians and Jews of Talmudic discipline will be very difficult to achieve, for, as Mgr. Carli says, speaking about the Jewish religion:

"It is not a question of the renunciation pure and simple of God's plan . . . but of positive opposition; in this respect the relationship between Christianity and Judaism is much worse than the relationship between Christianity and the other religions."

The generous intentions—or illusions—of the Council will always come up against a major obstacle, Jewish intransigence. The Jews demand everything but concede nothing; they refuse to assimilate, they refuse to convert; far from assimilating, they judaize, far from converting, they seek to impose their convictions on others.

"The Jewish problem presents an insoluble enigma more than two thousand years old, and today it is still one of the most formidable questions facing our times", wrote George Batault in *Le Problème juif*.

These prophetic words date from 1921. Notwithstanding so many dramatic events, so many disasters and world upheavals, they are still relevant today in 1967. Proof of it is the importance of the discussions on the Jewish question at the Second Vatican Council.

I4

TRACTS AGAINST THE COUNCIL

THIS is the title of an article on page 154 of the special issue of 6th March 1966 of the *Osservatore Della Domenica* on "Vatican Council II". The book as a whole gives a very complete history of the Council, and this particular article, which we reproduce below, was written by Ugo Apollonio, and is devoted to pamphlets on the Jewish question which had been widely distributed among the Council Fathers during the Council; in the course of the article my name is clearly singled out, and I am violently taken to task. This is what the article says:

Vatican Council II has been the object, as indeed might be expected, of the greatest praise and of the severest criticism. One cannot be surprised then, at the anti-conciliar literature which burst out, and it is perhaps worthwhile calling it to mind again briefly, if only out of curiosity. Unfortunately there is not enough space to examine Communist dailies and periodicals which frequently twisted the intentions and discussions of the Council Fathers in every country, nor can we deal with the secular Press, which in Italy and elsewhere often presented the works of the Council from a one-sided point of view.

Thus we will limit our study to a certain section of books and pamphlets, of limited quantity and quality, whose common characteristics suggest a common source, at least in their inspiration:

1. They all come from latin countries (in particular, from France, Spain, Latin-America);
2. They reflect the ideas of certain ultraconservative Catholic circles;
3. They are all either anonymous or pseudonymous; in certain instances they are concealed behind signatures subsequently discovered to be either imaginary or false;
4. They have been translated into several languages (the Italian translation is usually rather poor);
5. Most were distributed through the post and sent direct to the Council Fathers.

As far as their contents are concerned, it must be added that many of these publications are entrenched behind a suspect pre-occupation with orthodoxy, which they use as a pretext for ill-considered attacks on cardinals and bishops, whom they accuse of introducing heresies, seeking to subvert the Church, selling the Church for earthly rewards, and so on; on the other hand, others are distinctly anti-Semitic in tone and unjustly attack many representatives of the Church.

The first and most massive document—around which all the other lesser pamphlets which followed may be said to gravitate—was published in August 1962 under the pseudonym of Maurice Pinay. According to the introduction, this work should have contained “terrible revelations”, whereas it contains, on the contrary, a jumble of gratuitous and illogical accusations against the Council Fathers, whom—as it says in the Appeal to the Reader—“are conspiring in order to destroy the most sacred traditions by carrying out audacious and noxious reforms on the lines of Calvin, Zwingli and other great heretics, by pretending to modernise the Church and bring it up to date, but with the secret intention of opening the doors to Communism, accelerating the ruin of the free world, and preparing for the future destruction of Christianity.”

In a number of ronetyed leaflets, which arrived from America in 1964, one Hugh Mary Kellner attacks “the devastating results of secularism” and accuses the leaders of the Church of failing to “check the catastrophic decadence of Catholicism which has become apparent in recent decades”. According to this man, many Council Fathers were “victims of a satanic seduction suggestive of the use of the apparently laudable word of Christ to weaken and destroy the Church”.

However, the most important and bitter attacks were directed against “falsely converted Jews” and the “international Judaeo-Masonic B'nai B'rith organisation”. A number of pamphlets and circular letters were sent to the Council Fathers at their private addresses, asserting that “the Jewish people alone is the deicide people” and that as a result, it must be “fought and exterminated”, since “through Masonry, Communism and all the subversive organisations which it has created and directs, Judaism arrogantly and implacably continues to combat Christ”.

Racism, fanaticism and the most obstinate opposition were displayed by certain anti-Jewish groups in numerous small publications urging ferocious persecution against the Jews, “fathers of deceit and calumny”, quoting Church dogma or teaching in support or approval. As an example we quote from some which we have before us: *The Jews and the Council in the light of the Holy Scriptures and tradi-*

tion, anonymous—according to the pamphlet, the author is “Bernardus”; *The Jewish people is the deicide people* by Mauclair; *The Council and the attack of the central-European bloc by Catholicus*; *Judaeo-Masonic action in the Council* by an anonymous author who claims to be “a group of priests, some of whom belong to religious orders, and others to the secular clergy”; *The declaration in favour of the Jews favours a racism which infringes the legitimate right of defence of other peoples*, by one E. di Zaga; *The problem of the Jews at the Council* by L. de Poncins, etc. In all these pamphlets, just as in *Common Sense*, printed in New Jersey, and in yet others, the accusations are the same, and they spring from the same roots of misunderstanding, intolerance, scorn and hatred of the Jewish people.

The campaign, as we have remarked above, was not confined to Italy, but spread over the whole of the latin world. The principal people accused were clearly indicated. These are the “heretics”: the German theologians, Oesterreicher and Baum, both of the Jewish race, whose task was to “judaise the Christians”; Fr. Klyber, who “brainwashed Catholics in favour of the Jews”; and Cardinal Bea, who “in presenting his proposed decree in favour of the Jews and in opposition to the Evangelists, concealed from the Council Fathers that he was repeating the theses which had been suggested to him by the Masonic order of the B'nai B'rith”.

Cardinal Bea, who as we know created a study group in the heart of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, in obedience to the express wishes of Pope John, in order to examine from the solely theological and religious point of view the relations between the Church and the Jewish people, and who drafted the declaration on the Jewish problem—Cardinal Bea was attacked by all the anonymous authors of the various pamphlets with incredible vehemence and hostility. It is enough to remark that they attempted to prove his Jewish origin by maintaining that “in the past centuries the name of ‘Beha’ is found in several families in Germany and in Austria, a name which is the phonetic equivalent of the sephardic ‘Beja’, from the latinisation of which one arrives at the Jewish or crypto-Jewish Cardinal Bea”

In conclusion, it is sad to relate that even His Holiness Paul VI was not spared from the avalanche of venomous attacks unleashed against the Hierarchy. A little leaflet printed in November 1965 in California, U.S.A., and signed by the “Militant Servants of our Lady of Fatima”, states among other things that the Pope committed a “detestable error, comparable to an apostasy, by pronouncing a speech before the atheist representatives of the United Nations”, and

that 4th October—the date the Pope visited U.N.O.—is to be regarded as a black day in the calendar which has only been eclipsed by the crucifixion of Jesus, since on that day the Pontiff handed over the Mystical Body of Christ to the United Nations, an organisation controlled by Jews, Freemasons and Communists. What then was to be done? We are told: each Council Father was to submit to the rite of exorcism to drive out the devil which became incarnate in their persons in the Council; all the Council decisions were to be regarded as annulled; and they were to renew all their priestly offices and pray God to enable them to resist every other assault of Lucifer and his agents. Only thus could the Pope and the Council Fathers purify themselves of the odious crime of apostasy.

Any comment would be superfluous.

Ugo Apollonio.

Let us note that there are two *Osservatores* at Rome, both of which are produced in the Vatican City in the same office.

The *Osservatore Romano* daily is the official Vatican newspaper.

The position of the *Osservatore della Domenica*, on the other hand, is much less clear. As its name indicates, it is a weekly, and its editors are distinctly progressive which perhaps in part explains the tone of the article in which I am implicated.

Nevertheless, and this is very important, it is a special number which makes a big book of 225 pages. It contains a complete history and résumé of the Council, and there is a preface by His Eminence, Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State for the Vatican, and by Monsignor Felici, Secretary General of the Council. It has all the characteristics of an official Vatican document.

Thus the accusations against the authors of pamphlets on the Jewish problem, and against me in particular, are of exceptional gravity.

Although as a general rule I avoid all personal polemics, I find I am obliged to put this matter straight, since I carry the entire responsibility for the material I publish. Otherwise Catholics throughout the world who read this article will receive the impression that I am a fanatical anti-Semite, boiling over with fury and hatred, plotting massacres and persecution, and showering the Council Fathers with a jumble of gratuitous, illogical and calumnious accusations.

Let us then examine the accusations brought against me one by one.

The first accusation is that "they (the authors of these pamphlets) are all either anonymous or pseudonymous; in certain instances they are concealed behind signatures subsequently discovered to be either imaginary or false".

As far as I am concerned, this accusation is completely false, for my pamphlet was signed by my name.

The second accusation is that "many of these pamphlets are entrenched behind a suspect preoccupation with orthodoxy, which they use as a pretext for ill-considered attacks on Cardinals and Bishops, whom they accuse of introducing heresies, seeking to subvert the Church, selling the Church for earthly rewards, and so on; on the other hand, others are distinctly anti-Semitic in tone and unjustly attack many representatives of the Church".

However, I did not make an ill-considered attack on Cardinals and Bishops. I did not accuse them unjustly of seeking to subvert the Church.

Relying on Jewish sources, I demonstrated that through ignorance of the Jewish question they had fallen into a trap most skilfully prepared by the leaders of great Jewish organisations in conjunction with a small minority of progressives.

Doubtless the Council Fathers are well acquainted with the biblical Judaism of the Old Testament, but what do they know of contemporary talmudic Judaism?

The third accusation is the common origin of these pamphlets. "The first and most massive document—around which all the other lesser pamphlets which followed may be said to gravitate—was published in August 1962 under the pseudonym of Maurice Pinay. According to the introduction, this work should have contained 'terrible revelations', whereas it contains, on the contrary, a jumble of gratuitous and illogical accusations against the Council Fathers."

The pamphlet which I circulated at the Council has nothing in common with Maurice Pinay's book, nor for that matter, with any of the other pamphlets published at Rome. As far as I am aware, I am the only person to have made known the role of Jules Isaac, spokesman of the great Jewish organisations, in the Vatican Council, and the only person to have circulated to the Council texts from the works of Jules Isaac, Joshua Jehouda and other doctors of Israel, texts which were fundamental to a comprehension of the issue on which the Council Fathers voted.

The fourth accusation is that of inciting to massacre and persecution against the deicide people. "However, the most important and bitter attacks were directed against 'falsely converted Jews' and the 'international judaeo-masonic B'nai B'rith organisation'. A number of pamphlets and circular letters were sent to the Council Fathers at their private addresses, asserting that 'the Jewish people alone is

the decide people', and that as a result, it must be 'fought and exterminated', since 'through Masonry, Communism and all the subversive organisations which it has created and directs, Judaism arrogantly and implacably continues to combat Christ'."

Nowhere have I ever written that the Jewish decide people had to be fought and exterminated.

The article continues: "Racism, fanaticism and the most obstinate opposition were displayed by certain anti-Jewish groups in numerous small publications urging ferocious persecution against the Jews, 'fathers of deceit and calumny', quoting Church dogma or teaching in support or approval. As an example we quote from some of these violent publications which we have before us: *The Problem of the Jews at the Council* by L. de Poncins, etc. In all these pamphlets, just as in *Common Sense*, printed in New Jersey and in yet others, the accusations are the same and they spring from the same roots of misunderstanding, intolerance, scorn and hatred of the Jewish people."

Racism, fanaticism, ferocious persecution, intolerance, incomprehension, scorn and hatred towards the Jewish people! I have never written one single line which could be construed as a foundation for any of these accusations, but since I am virtually described as a "pogromist", I would ask the fair-minded reader to consider the degree of violence implicit in the methods and proposals for a solution to the Jewish problem which I drew up shortly before the outbreak of the last war, in a document which was sent to Heads of State and Jewish leaders all over the world, and which is reproduced here in full in Appendix I.

The fifth accusation is that "the campaign, as we have remarked above, was not confined to Italy, but spread over the whole of the latin world. . . . Cardinal Bea, in presenting his proposed decree in favour of the Jews and in opposition to the Evangelists, concealed from the Council Fathers that he was repeating the theses which had been suggested to him by the Masonic order of the B'nai B'rith. Cardinal Bea, who as we know created a study group in the heart of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, in obedience to the express wishes of Pope John, in order to examine from the solely theological and religious point of view the relations between the Church and the Jewish people, and who drafted the declaration on the Jewish problem—Cardinal Bea was attacked by all the anonymous authors of the various pamphlets with incredible vehemence and hostility. It is enough to remark that they attempted to prove his Jewish origin by maintaining that 'in the past centuries the name of "Beha" is found in several families in Germany and Austria, a name which

is the phonetic equivalent of the sephardic "Beja", from the latinisation of which one arrives at the Jewish or crypto-Jewish Cardinal Bea'"

I did not attack Cardinal Bea with "incredible vehemence and hostility"; I only wrote the following few lines about him. Some time after (his visit to the Pope), Isaac "learned with joy that his suggestions had been considered by the Pope and handed on to Cardinal Bea for examination. The latter set up a special working party in the bosom of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, to study relations between the Church and Israel, which finally resulted in the Council Vote on 20th November 1964."

The sixth and final accusation is that "it is sad to relate that even His Holiness Paul VI was not spared from the avalanche of venomous attacks unleashed against the Hierarchy".

But the only mention that I made of Pope Paul VI was in the following lines: "(After the vote in November 1964) the Sovereign Pontiff, considering that a vote with such considerable bearings on politics and doctrine needed ripe reflection, refused to ratify it, and postponed the decision to the next and final session of the Council, which is to open on 14th September 1965. The final vote on the Jewish question took place on 14th October 1965 and was promulgated by the Pope on 28th October."

In a word, then, the accusations against me in the *Osservatore della Domenica* are completely false, and can only be accounted for by the ignorance or bad faith of the author of this article. All who struggle against the forces of subversion in the modern world encounter this procedure. Nesta Webster, who specialised in the study of revolutionary movements, relates her own experiences in her *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* (preface, v):

"When I first began to write on revolution a well-known London publisher said to me, 'Remember that if you take an anti-revolutionary line you will have the whole literary world against you.' This appears to me extraordinary. . . . If I was wrong either in my conclusions or facts I was prepared to be challenged. Should not years of laborious historical research meet either with recognition or with reasoned and scholarly refutation? But although my book received a great many generous and appreciative reviews in the Press, criticisms which were hostile took a form which I had never anticipated. Not a single honest attempt was made to refute either my *French Revolution* or *World Revolution* by the usual methods of controversy; statements founded on documentary evidence were met with flat contradiction unsupported by a shred

of counter-evidence. In general the plan adopted was not to disprove, but to discredit by means of flagrant misquotations, by attributing to me views I had never expressed, or even by means of offensive personalities. It will surely be admitted that this method of attack is unparalleled in any other spheres of literary controversy.

"It is interesting to note that precisely the same line was adopted a hundred years ago with regard to Professor Robison and the Abbé Barruel, whose works on the secret causes of the French Revolution created an immense sensation in their day."

There is nothing new in these methods, but it is perhaps surprising to find a publication, which by all appearances is the spokesman of the Vatican, using similar methods when it is a question as serious as a conciliar vote which may alter the age-old doctrine of the Church, and the behaviour of millions of Catholics throughout the world.

However, now that the reader has been informed of all the necessary documents in the case, he may judge for himself.

15

HOW THE JEWS CHANGED CATHOLIC THINKING

THE article in the *Osservatore della Domenica* takes me to task for having brought calumnious and totally unjustified accusations against Cardinal Bea.

But a bomb exploded on 25th January 1966, for on that date an American review published documents of the highest interest on the role of Cardinal Bea and the world Jewish organisations in Vatican Council II.

In their issue of that date the magazine *Look*, which numbers 7,500,000 readers, published a leading article entitled "How the Jews changed Catholic Thinking"—written by their senior editor, Joseph Roddy—which gave many details of the secret negotiations held in New York and Rome by Cardinal Bea with the leaders of the great world Jewish organisations, such as the B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, and others.

The author begins the article by recalling the responsibility of the Catholic Church, for, as he says, her doctrinal teaching is the principal cause of anti-Semitism in the modern world, and it is worth noting that on this point he faithfully follows Jules Isaac's thesis.

Space prevents us from reproducing more than the following important passages, which we have selected from the article:

"The best hope that the Church of Rome will not again seem an accomplice to genocide is the fourth chapter of its *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions*, which Pope Paul VI declared Church law near the end of Vatican Council II. At no place in his address from the Chair of Peter did the Pope talk of Jules Isaac. But perhaps the Archbishop of Aix, Charles de Provençères, had made Isaac's role perfectly clear some few years earlier. 'It is a sign of the times', the Archbishop said, 'that a layman, and a Jewish layman at that, has become the originator of a Council decree.'"

Roddy then mentions the work of Jules Isaac and the book which he published on the question of the relations between Jews and Christians. To return to the article:

"Isaac's book was noticed. In 1949, Pope Pius XII received its author briefly. But eleven years went by before Isaac saw real hope. In Rome, in mid-June 1960, the French Embassy pressed Isaac on to the Holy See. Isaac wanted to see John XXIII. Isaac went to Augustin Bea, the one German Jesuit in the College of Cardinals. 'In him I found powerful support', Isaac said. The next day the support was even stronger. John XXIII . . . reached for Jules Isaac's hand, then sat beside him. 'I asked if I might take away some sparks of hope', Isaac recalled. John said he had a right to more than hope. After Isaac left, John made it clear to the administrators in the Vatican's Curia that a firm condemnation of Catholic anti-Semitism was to come from the Council he had called. To John, the German Cardinal seemed the right legislative whip for the job.

"By then, there was a fair amount of talk passing between the Vatican Council offices and Jewish groups, and both the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith were heard loud and clear in Rome. Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel of New York's Jewish Theological Seminary, who first knew of Bea in Berlin thirty years ago, met with the Cardinal in Rome. Bea had already read the American Jewish Committee's *The Image of the Jews in Catholic Teaching*. It was followed by another A.J.C. paper, the twenty-three page study, *Anti-Jewish Elements in Catholic Liturgy*. Speaking for the A.J.C. Heschel said he hoped the Vatican Council would purge Catholic teaching of all suggestions that the Jews were a cursed race. And in doing that, Heschel felt, the Council should in no way exhort Jews to become Christians. About the same time, Israel's Dr. Nahum Goldmann, head of the World Conference of Jewish Organisations, whose members ranged in creed from the most orthodox to liberal, pressed its aspirations on the Pope. B'nai B'rith wanted the Catholics to delete all language from the Church services that could even seem anti-Semitic. Not then, nor in any time to come, would that be a simple thing to do.

"The Catholic liturgy, where it was drawn from writings of the early Church Fathers, could easily be edited. But not the Gospels. Even if Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were better at evangelism than history, their writings were divinely inspired, according to Catholic dogma, and about as easy to alter as the centre of the sun. That difficulty put both Catholics with the very

best intentions and Jews with the deepest understanding of Catholicism in a theological fix. It also brought out the conservative opposition in the Church and, to some extent, Arab anxieties in the Middle East. The conservative charge against the Jews was that they were deicides, guilty of killing God in the human-divine person of Christ. . . . Clearly, then, Catholic Scripture would be at issue if the Council spoke about deicides and Jews. Wise and long-mitred heads around the Curia warned that the bishops in Council should not touch this issue with ten-foot staffs. But still there was John XXIII, who said they must.

"If the inviolability of Holy Writ was most of the problem in Rome, the rest was the Arab-Israeli war. . . . In Rome the word from the Middle East and the conservatives was that a Jewish declaration would be inopportune. From the West, where 225,500 more Jews live in New York than in Israel, the word was that dropping the declaration would be a calamity. . . .

"Still, for the bishops, there was quite a bit of supplementary reading on Jews. Some agency close enough to the Vatican to have the addresses in Rome of the Council's 2,200 visiting Cardinals and Bishops, supplied each with a 900 page book, *Il Complotto contro la Chiesa* (*The Plot Against the Church*). In it, among reams of scurrility, was a kind of fetching shred of truth. Its claim that the Church was being infiltrated by Jews would intrigue anti-Semites. For, in fact, ordained Jews around Rome working on the Jewish declaration included Father Baum, as well as Mgr. John Oesterreicher, on Bea's staff at the Secretariat. Bea, himself, according to the Cairo daily, *Al Gomhuria*, was a Jew named Behar.

"Neither Baum nor Oesterreicher was with Bea in the late afternoon on 31st March 1963, when a limousine was waiting for him outside the Hotel Plaza in New York. The ride ended about six blocks away, outside the offices of the American Jewish Committee. There a latter-day Sanhedrin was waiting to greet the head of the Secretariat for Christian Unity. The gathering was kept secret from the Press. Bea wanted neither the Holy See nor the Arab League to know he was there to take questions the Jews wanted to hear answered. 'I am not authorised to speak officially,' he told them. 'I can, therefore, speak only of what, in my opinion, could be effected, indeed, should be effected, by the Council.' Then he spelled out the problem. 'In round terms,' he said, 'the Jews are accused of being guilty of deicide, and on them is supposed to lie a curse.' He countered both charges. Because even in the accounts of the Evangelists, only the leaders of the Jews then in Jerusalem and a very small group of followers shouted

for the death sentence on Jesus, all those absent and the generations of Jews unborn were not implicated in deicide in any way, Bea said. As to the curse, it could not condemn the crucifiers anyway, the Cardinal reasoned, because Christ's dying words were a prayer for their pardon.

"The rabbis in the room wanted to know then if the declaration would specify deicide, the curse and the rejection of the Jewish people by God as errors in Christian teaching. Implicit in their question was the most touchy problem of the New Testament.

"Bea's answer was oblique. 'Actually,' he went on, 'it is wrong to seek the chief cause of anti-Semitism in purely religious sources—in the Gospel accounts, for example. These religious causes, in so far as they are adduced (often they are not), are often merely an excuse and a veil to cover over other more operative reasons for enmity'. . . .

"Not long after that, the Rolf Hochhuth play *The Deputy* opened to depict Pius XII as the Vicar of Christ who fell silent while Hitler went to the Final Solution. Montini, the Archbishop of Milan, wrote an attack on the play in the *Tablet* of London, and a defence of the Pope, whose secretary he had been. A few months later, Pope John XXIII was dead, and Montini became Pope Paul VI.

"At the second session of the Council, in autumn 1963, the Jewish declaration came to the bishops as chapter four of the larger declaration *On Ecumenism*. . . . but the session ended without the vote on the Jews or religious liberty, and on a distinctly sour note, despite the Pope's announced visit to the Holy Land. 'Something had happened behind the scenes', the voice of the National Catholic Welfare Conference wrote. '(It is) one of the mysteries of the second session.'

"Two very concerned Jewish gentlemen who had to reflect hard on such mysteries were 59-year-old Joseph Lichten of B'nai B'rith's Anti-Defamation League in New York, and Zachariah Shuster, 63, of the American Jewish Committee. The strongest possible Jewish declaration was their common cause."

The article in *Look* then gives a detailed report of the frantic efforts made in Rome by the representatives of the great Jewish organisations, and we learn that apparently the *New York Times*, whose owners and directors are Jewish, was the best informed paper on the progress of the negotiations. "To find out how the Council was going, many U.S. bishops in Rome depended on what they read in the *New York Times*. And so did the A.J.C. and the B'nai B'rith. That paper was the place to make points."

Then, "Mgr. George Higgins, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington, D.C., helped arrange a papal audience for U.N. Ambassador, Arthur J. Goldberg, who was a Supreme Court Justice at the time. Rabbi Heschel briefed Goldberg before the Justice and the Pope discussed the declaration . . . and Cardinal Cushing arranged an audience with the Pope for Heschel. With the A.J.C.'s Shuster beside him, Heschel talked hard about deicide and guilt, and asked the Pontiff to press for a declaration in which Catholics would be forbidden to proselytise Jews. Paul, somewhat affronted, would in no way agree . . . and the audience did not end as cordially as it began. . . .

"The Rabbi's audience with Paul in the Vatican, like Bea's meeting with the A.J.C. in New York, was granted on the condition that it would be kept secret. It was undercover summit conferences of that sort that led conservatives to claim that American Jews were the new powers behind the Church.

"But on the floor of the Council, things looked even worse to the conservatives. There, it seemed to them as if Catholic bishops were working for the Jews. At issue was the weakened text. . . . The Arab bishops argued that a declaration favouring Jews would expose Catholics to persecution as long as Arabs fought Israelis. Their allies in this holy war were conservative Italians, Spaniards and South Americans. They saw the structure of the faith being shaken by theological liberals who thought Church teaching could change.

"When the declaration reappeared at the third session's end, it was in a wholly new document called *The Declaration of the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions*. In that setting, the bishops approved it with a 1,770 to 185 vote. There was considerable joy among Jews in the United States because their declaration had finally come out.

"In fact it had not.

"There were troubles to face. In Segni, near Rome, Bishop Luigi Carli wrote in the February 1965 issue of his diocesan magazine that the Jews of Christ's time and their descendants down to the present were collectively guilty of Christ's death. A few weeks later, on Passion Sunday, at an outdoor Mass in Rome, Pope Paul talked of the Crucifixion and the Jews' heavy part in it. Rome's chief rabbi, Elio Toaff, said in saddened reply that in 'even the most qualified Catholic personalities, the imminence of Easter causes prejudices to re-emerge'.

"On 25th April 1965, the *New York Times* correspondent in Rome, Robert C. Doty . . . said the Jewish declaration was in

trouble . . . and that the Pope had turned it over to four consultants to clear it of its contradictions to Scripture and make it less objectionable to Arabs. It was about as refuted as a *Times* story ever gets. When Cardinal Bea arrived in New York three days later, he had his priest-secretary deny Doty's story by saying that his Secretariat for Christian Unity still had full control of the Jewish declaration. Then came an apologia for Paul's sermon. 'Keep in mind that the Pope was speaking to ordinary and simple faithful people—not before a learned body', the priest said. As to the anti-Semitic Bishop of Segni, the Cardinal's man said that Carli's views were definitely not those of the Secretariat. Moriss B. Abram of the A.J.C. was at the airport to greet Bea and found his secretary's views on that reassuring.

"In Rome a few days later, some fraction of the Secretariat met to vote on the bishop's suggested *modi*. On 15th May, the Secretariat closed its meeting, and the bishops went their separate ways . . . all with lips sealed.

"In fact, the study was finished, the damage was done, and there existed what many regard as a substantially new declaration on the Jews.

"At Vatican II's fourth and last session, there was no help in sight. And things were happening very fast. The text came out weakened, as the *Times* said it would. Then the Pope took off for the U.N., where his *jamais plus la guerre* speech was a triumph. After that, he greeted the president of the A.J.C. in an East Side Church. That looked good for the cause. . . . But the opposition, not content with a weakened declaration, wanted the total victory of no declaration at all. For that, the Arab's last words were 'respectfully submitted' in a twenty-eight-page memorandum calling on the bishops to save the faith from 'Communism and atheism and the Jewish-Communist alliance'.

"In Rome, the bishops' vote was set for 14th October and to Lichten and Shuster, the prospects of anything better looked almost hopeless. There were telephone calls to be made to the A.J.C. and the B'nai B'rith in New York, but these were not much help at either end. . . . Lichten sent telegrams to about twenty-five bishops he thought could still help retrieve the strong text, but Higgins quietly told him to give up. Abbé René Laurentin, a Council staff man (and correspondent of *Le Figaro*) wrote to all the bishops with a last-minute appeal to conscience.

"Finally, the vote took place, and exactly 250 bishops voted against the declaration, while 1,763 supported it. Through much of the U.S. and Europe, the Press minutes later made the complex simple with headlines reading VATICAN PARDONS JEWS, JEWS

NOT GUILTY or JEWS EXONERATED IN ROME. Glowing statements came from spokesmen of the A.J.C. and B'nai B'rith, but each had a note of disappointment that the strong declaration had been diluted. Bea's friend Heschel was the harshest and called the Council's failure to deal with deicide 'an act of paying homage to Satan'.

"A view popular in the U.S. was that some kind of forgiveness had been granted the Jews. The notion was both started and sustained by the Press, but there was no basis for it in the declaration. . . . And one of the hypotheses that B'nai B'rith and the A.J.C. must ponder is that much Arab resistance and some theological intransigence were creatures of Jewish lobbying. . . . There are Catholics close to what went on in Rome who think that Jewish energy did harm. . . . There were many bishops at the Council who felt Jewish pressure in Rome and resented it. They thought Bea's enemies were proved right when the Council secrets turned up in American papers. 'He wants to turn the Church over to the Jews,' the hatemongers said of the old cardinal, and some dogmatics in the Council thought the charge about right.

"Father Felix Morlion at the Pro Deo University, who heads the study group working closely with the A.J.C. thought the promulgated text the best. . . . Morlion knew just what the Jews did to get the declaration and why the Catholics had settled for its compromise. 'We could have beaten the dogmatics', he insisted. They could indeed, but the cost would have been a split in the Church."

(Look, 25th January 1966, pp. 19-23)

This article is of the utmost interest for it gives us numerous details of Cardinal Bea's secret negotiations with the leaders of the great American Jewish organisations, and in particular with the B'nai B'rith.

The author of the article is obviously in close contact with these leaders and it must almost certainly have been they who supplied him with his documentation. Cardinal Bea has all his sympathy and is depicted as making incessant efforts for the triumph of the Jewish cause at Rome.

Far from being the product of "anti-Semitic" opponents, it is written and produced by parties eminently favourable to the Jewish cause, and thus cannot be dismissed as a work motivated by hatred or bad faith.

It was read by 7,500,000 people at least, and yet, as far as I know, the publication of this extraordinary document produced no reaction at Rome or anywhere else. In the whole Catholic Church no one has risen to express astonishment or ask for an explanation.

In these circumstances we would be glad to read at least a reasoned reply from the Vatican, failing which we are obliged to conclude that Cardinal Bea came to a secret understanding with the leaders of the great American Jewish organisations, and in particular with the B'nai B'rith, to work for the triumph of the Jewish cause, despite the opposition of the conservatives in the Curia and elsewhere.

However that may be, the spectacle of a cardinal in one of the highest posts of the Catholic Hierarchy offering excuses to American Jews because the Pope had read from and commented on the Gospel account of the Passion in Holy Week, is something which had never yet been seen in the whole two thousand years of the history of Christianity.

This claim of the Jews to have the Gospels censored has spread since the new attitude adopted by the Council. On 1st January 1966, *La Terre Retrouvée*, a Zionist publication from Paris, published an article about a six volume Sacred History by Hachette. The following is a typical passage from the article in question:

"What we take exception to in these very beautiful colour printed volumes, is their conformity. . . .

"Their pictures are a servile and pious amplification of the text. And the text, as far as the Old Testament is concerned, is resumed in conformity with the official doctrine of the Church on the role of Christ, as is shown, for example, by the title of the fourth volume in the series—*From David to the Messiah*. It is taken for granted that the Messiah has come, that David's line leads to him, and that the Messiah is Jesus. Doubtless one can argue this problem of the Messiah with Israel in theology, or in all sorts of other fields. But boys and girls should not be served with a truth which is only a Gospel truth and which the whole teaching of Israel denies.

"Of course, we do not claim that only ecumenical Sacred History may be taught. That would be impossible. Nor do we claim that Christian teaching should censor itself, except—and we believe that in this matter, since the Council, it has a positive obligation—when it is a question of replacing the doctrine of contempt of the Jews with the doctrine of esteem . . . the idea of one sowing hatred in the souls of the boys and girls for whom these books were written is a frightful thing to contemplate."

(Paul Giniewski: *La Terre Retrouvée*)

Thus, according to *La Terre Retrouvée*, spreading the knowledge of the Gospels is to propagate throughout the world a frightful seed of hatred!

APPENDIX I

APPEAL TO HEADS OF STATE

WE give below the text of an appeal personally addressed by the author almost exactly one year before the Second World War broke out to the heads of State all over the world, suggesting the creation of an international commission as the first step to be taken towards a peaceful solution of the Jewish problem:

The experience of forty centuries of history bears witness over a longer period than any other known example to the fact that there is such a thing as the Jewish problem.

For forty centuries the essential features of the problem have scarcely changed, whether in the political, religious or economic fields.

At first sight, it would appear that it is insoluble and that all that one can do is to let events take their course, accepting crisis after crisis, persecution after persecution and a permanent element of disorder as an inherent part of the very constitution of the white races. In this case there would be no problem to solve. It would simply be a question of recording Jews and non-Jews pursuing with all their power and with the aid of as many allies as possible the enslavement and destruction of their adversary.

Today events seem to be moving towards this dangerous state of affairs.

The stakes are as high as the danger is immense. Conquered, the West would lose its historic personality and be obliged to renounce its mission.

Conquered, the Jews would emerge from the struggle crushed as they had never been before. But what a price the West would have to pay for its victory.

We write this with the full courage of our convictions—as we always have—but we do not think that a catastrophe is inevitable, nor that the problem can only be solved by an Apocalyptic conflagration in which atrocious violence and persecution is unleashed. If the problem with which we are concerned has till now appeared insoluble, it seems to us that this is largely due to the fact that it has never been studied in a spirit of rigorous and scientific im-

partiality. And doubtless this is because, blinded by passion, *neither side have really wanted to study it, because, for various reasons, neither side have really wanted to solve it.*

Violence, curses and complaints are none of them valid arguments bringing a solution to the problem.

We must approach the problem as scholars using scholarly arguments in order to attempt to elucidate a difficult question to some purpose.

We consider that Jews and non-Jews, anti-Semites and philo-Semites in good faith alike, who are convinced that they have something essential to defend and maintain, both have something essential to gain from an attentive and comprehensive study of the question that divides them.

Without being under any illusion as to the magnitude and difficulty of the task before us, but in an endeavour to achieve at least some useful results, we have taken the initiative in suggesting the foundation of an INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE TO STUDY THE JEWISH QUESTION.

The Institute would be strongly organised and established in some neutral and symbolical town such as Geneva or the Hague. Competent and representative personalities, Jewish and non-Jewish, hostile and favourable to Judaism, but all of indisputably high moral and intellectual standing, would collaborate in it.

A certain number of precise and well-defined questions, drawn up by the Institute's Council of Direction, composed of Jews and non-Jews, would be set before the Institute's two departments for the criticism and defence of Judaism and its influence, who would share them out among the competent sections. The results obtained on either side would be brought together and discussed in inter-departmental sessions. The conclusions adopted in common agreement would be communicated to the governments of the Western nations and brought to the knowledge of public opinion in all countries. In case of disagreement, a strictly objective summary of the arguments produced by both sides would be published in order to pave the way for future studies.

The very fact that common agreement could be reached on studying the Jewish problem, which is so delicate and so complex, in a spirit of rigorous scientific impartiality, would constitute a great step forward in itself likely to diminish passions which today have become so dangerously exasperated.

We have no doubt that all the States, all the Governments and all the great Jewish organisations of the whole world, whatever attitude they may adopt with regard to the Jewish question, will give our idea consideration and support its immediate realisation.

We appeal to all people of good will to seek out the truth, remembering Dostoevsky's words that "whoever sincerely seeks the truth is already, by that fact, armed with a terrible force" and that finally, if men "enter into the path of truth, they will find it".

It is in this firm conviction that we launch our appeal with indestructible confidence.

Something must be done!

Apart from high Authorities to whom it is destined, the present Appeal will be sent to a great number of personalities in all countries of every shade of opinion. We would be obliged if those who are interested would write and offer us their reflexions, suggestions and criticism. And we will be especially grateful to those who make a material contribution towards a special fund which will be set up to help us diffuse our idea and achieve our object.

LEON DE PONCINS

GEORGE BATAULT

The World War, which broke out shortly afterwards, put an end to our endeavours.

bring to light important facts and documents which lay open to question everything that has been written on this aspect of the war.

The following is a résumé of Rassinier's thesis:

APPENDIX II

SIX MILLION INNOCENT VICTIMS

SIX million dead, such is the fearful figure with which the organisations of Jewry ceaselessly confront the world; it is the unanswered argument of which they availed themselves at the Council in order to obtain a revision of the Catholic Liturgy.

This figure of six million, to which the Jewish organisations testified, was neither verified nor checked in any way whatsoever, and it served as the foundation for the prosecution at the time of the Nuremberg Trial, and was widely disseminated by the Press of the whole world.

Today many facts and documents have come to light which were not known at that time and it is no longer possible to give credence to this figure.

A French Socialist of the left, who was himself deported to Buchenwald, Mr. Paul Rassinier, has made a prolonged and extremely detailed study of this question, which he published in four large volumes, summarised in this chapter.

Rassinier reached the conclusion that the number of Jews who died after deportation is approximately 1,200,000, and this figure, he tells us, has finally been accepted as valid by the Centre Mondial de Documentation Juive Contemporaine. Likewise he notes that Paul Hilberg, in his study of the same problem, reached a total of 896,292 victims.

So many exaggerations and impostures have completely distorted the facts that we deem it only fair to make known to the reader, who is concerned for historical truth, what were the real ingredients of an incontestably tragic drama, but one which, reduced to its proper proportions must be seen in the entire context of the Second World War, which indeed numbered many millions of innocent victims on all sides.

The notes which follow are taken from the two most recent works of Rassinier: *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann ou les Vainqueurs Incorrigeables* and *Le Drame des Juifs européens*. The author must bear the responsibility for what he has written. For our part it would seem that these books represent a testimony of great value, for they

It was during the course of the trial of major German war criminals at Nuremberg, 1945-46, that the number of Jews alleged to have been the victims of German concentration camps and gas chambers was first put forward.

In his speech of indictment on 21st November 1945, Mr. Justice Jackson declared that of 9,500,000 Jews who had been living in Germany-occupied Europe, 4,500,000 had disappeared.

This figure was not retained by the court, but was nevertheless soon transformed by the Press to ten millions, and then reduced to an average of six million, where it scored a resounding success, and was definitely accepted by the whole world.

It had been approximately established by specialists in Jewish demography by two methods:

Either, as was done by the World Jewish Congress, by comparing the data of, respectively, the pre-war and post-war figures of the Jewish population of the various European occupied countries, resulting in a loss of six million. Unfortunately these statistics do not take into account important emmigration movements by the Jewish population of Europe between 1933-45, particularly towards Palestine and the United States, which meant that they were established on completely false foundations;

Or by means of the oral or written declarations of "witnesses" which for the most part have proved, after serious investigation, to be full of contradictions, exaggerations and falsehoods, and which cannot therefore any longer be taken into consideration.

Indeed, some of these "witnesses", such as Pastor Martin Niemöller, who had been a fervent adherent of National Socialism, have felt a need to clear themselves and outbid everyone else, so as to appear more sincere.

"Pastor Niemöller claimed in a lecture which he delivered on the 3rd July 1946, and which was published under the title of *Der Weg ins Freie* by Franz M. Helbach at Stuttgart that '238,756 persons were incinerated at Dachau'."

However. "On 16th March 1962, Mgr. Neuhäussler, the auxiliary Bishop of Munich, made a speech at Dachau itself before the representatives of fifteen nations who had come there to celebrate the liberation of the camp, which was reported next day in *Le Figaro* in these words:

"This afternoon, in intense cold and despite the aggravation of snow, the pilgrims have gathered together in the camp at Dachau

where 30,000 men were exterminated of the 200,000 persons from thirty-eight nations who were interned there from 1939-45."

(Paul Rassinier: *Le Drame des Juifs européens*, p. 12)

The testimony of men such as Rudolph Hess, the SS officers Hoelbrigel, Hoettl, Wiscelicy, and others . . . who were amongst the accused at Nuremberg, and who were faced with the prospect either of being condemned to death or with the hope of obtaining a reprieve, is highly suspect. Having been frequently subjected to ill-treatment or threats during their detention, they seem to have said or written what was desired of them.

Others, who had survived the German concentration camps, perhaps felt guilty for reprehensible acts which they had committed and for which they might now be required to answer before a court; such was the case of the Czech Communist doctor, Blaha, who had belonged to the self-direction committee of the camp at Dachau, or Professor Balachowsky of the Institut Pasteur of Paris, who was deported to Buchenwald, and who had a predilection for dabbling in crime. Those most directly affected fell back, to exculpate themselves, on the necessity of obeying orders under pain of disappearing. It is not surprising that under these conditions there should be something a little "forced" about their declarations. Other survivors only witnessed what happened at second-hand, such as Dr. Kautsky; they based their declarations not upon what they themselves "saw" but upon what they "heard", always from "reliable" sources, who by some chance are almost always dead and thus not in a position to confirm or invalidate their statements.

Scant testimony indeed upon which to establish with absolute certainty the number of victims in the camps. And yet this figure of six million dead has been given world-wide publicity and accepted as an article of faith without being checked or verified in any way whatsoever. It owes its success to the abundant growth of concentration-camp literature, which is cosmopolitan and mainly Jewish, full of both imposture and falsehood.

We give below a list of some of the most typical titles of works of this kind, headed by *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, by Professor Rafael Lemkin, a Polish Jew, who fled to England and was the first to accuse National Socialist Germany of the crime of genocide.

Numerous writers subsequently took up this thesis:

Chaines et Lumières by Abbé Jean-Paul Renard.

The Destruction of the European Jews by Paul Hilberg.

Le Bréviaire de la Haine by Léon Poliakov.

Le 3ème Reich et les Juifs by L. Poliakov and Wulf.

Documentation sur les gaz by H. Krausnik.

Mémoires de Rudolf Hess, published in part under the title of *Le Commandant d'Auschwitz parle*. . .
Le Vicaire by Rudolf Hochhuth.

But the palm, Rassinier tells us, is undoubtedly awarded to the unbelievable work of the Jewish Hungarian Doctor, Miklos Nyizli: *Médecin à Auschwitz*.

By its falsification of facts, the evident contradictions and shameless lies, this book seems to show that Dr. Nyizli is speaking of places which it is transparent he has never visited, not to mention that it is a document of extremely doubtful authenticity, as Rassinier has shown. (*Le Drame des Juifs européens*, p. 52).

If one is to believe the distinguished "Doctor of Auschwitz", 25,000 victims were exterminated each day for four and a half years. This amounts to 1,642 days which, at 25,000 a day, produces a total of forty-one million victims, in other words, two and a half times the total pre-war Jewish population of the world.

When Rassinier attempted to discover the identity of this strange "witness", he was told that "he had died some time before the publication of the book".

Today, when numerous documents still unknown at the time of the Nuremberg Trial have been exhumed and made public, it would seem to be difficult to continue to maintain the figure of six million Jewish victims, as do both Jules Isaac, in his two books *Jésus et Israël* and *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme* and Vladimir Jankélévitch, Professor of the School of Arts and Humane Sciences, at Paris, in the article in *Le Monde* from which we have quoted an extract above, and it is becoming increasingly recognised that this figure has been considerably exaggerated, and that it does not in any way correspond to reality.¹

During the trial of Eichmann at Jerusalem the figure of six million was not mentioned in court:

"The prosecution at the Jerusalem trial was considerably weakened by its central motif, the six million European Jews² exterminated in the great mass of the gas-chambers.

"It was an argument that easily won conviction the day after the war ended, amidst the general state of spiritual and material chaos. Today many documents have been published which were

¹ However, the world Press continues to publish these figures. The weekly *Paris-Match*, in its special issue of 20th March 1965, on the capture of Berlin, wrote that "in the death camps fifteen million deportees were assassinated".

² This figure was only mentioned by the Press and by witnesses; the charge drawn up by Mr. Gideon Haussner simply said "some" millions.

not available at the time of the Nuremberg trials, and which tend to prove that if the Jewish nationals were odiously wronged and persecuted by the Hitler régime, there could not possibly have been six million victims." (P. Rassinier, *ibid.*, p. 125)

Indeed, contrary to the estimates put forward at Nuremberg by Mr. Justice Jackson and at Jerusalem during the Eichmann trial by Professor Shalom Baron, the total Jewish population of Europe was far from being as high as 9,600,000, as the former claimed, or 9,800,000, as maintained by the latter.

Between 1933 and 1945 large numbers of Jews from Central Europe emigrated to other countries in order to avoid first the interference and later the persecution of the Germans. Recent statistics confirm this. In his book *Le Drame des Juifs européens*, Rassinier deals with this point in the light of extremely precise information. We recommend the reader who is interested to consult the work himself.

This is the gist of what he says:

Taking into account the constant flow of emigration, Mr. Arthur Ruppin, the most authoritative of the Jewish statisticians, estimates the population at that time at 5,710,000; the Centre de Documentation Juive of Paris and Doctor Korherr put it as respectively 5,294,000 and 5,500,000, and the latter would appear to be the closest to reality. Thus, omitting this calculation, the statistics of survivors established in 1945 are found to be completely false and the margin of error in relation to them represents about 40 per cent of the real figure. The number of survivors, therefore, was not 1,651,000 as was claimed at that time, but something in the order of 4,200,000 or more, which reduces the figure of the missing to between one and one and a half million, and represents a large percentage of the victims.

Another source of error in the calculation of the number of victims stems from the fact that as the Russian troops advanced, deportees were brought back from Poland to the western camps of Buchenwald, Dora, Dachau, and others (J. Rassinier: *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann*, pp. 94-95). These men, who had been registered upon their arrival at Auschwitz or elsewhere, were not to be found when these camps were liberated, and were put down as missing or exterminated in the gas-chambers if they were Jews. In reality they were alive and kicking in the German camps further west, but the timing of their arrival had rendered their subsequent registration impossible and no real record of it had been kept.

There is a further point to consider. The toll of mortality in camps reserved for Jews was undoubtedly higher than in the others. But

after minute investigation one must perforce admit that, in general, if the responsibility for the high mortality of the camps rested with the SS men who were in charge of them, it rested even more with the detainees who were in charge of the administration of these camps.

According to Rassinier, the number of missing evaluated above is corroborated today by the statistical studies of the Centre Mondial de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, which gives a figure of 1,485,292 Jewish victims. As we have noted, Paul Hilberg accounts for 896,292 victims.

But of one fact, he tells us, and it is the most explosive to emerge from his books, there is now no doubt at all. Very serious investigations carried out on the sites themselves have revealed with irrefutable proof that contrary to the declarations of the above-named "witnesses", whether it is a question of Buchenwald, Dora, Mathausen, Bergen-Belsen or Dachau, not one of the camps throughout the whole of German territory was fitted with gas-chambers. This fact has been recognised and attested by the Institute of Contemporary History at Munich, a model of hostility to National Socialist Germany.

At Dachau the construction of a gas-chamber had in fact been begun but it was only completed at the end of the war by SS men who had taken the place of the deportees.

Nevertheless Doctor Blaha has given up copious details of the exterminations which apparently took place in this camp. Fr. Jean-Paul Renard wrote in his book *Chaines et Lumières* that he "had seen thousands upon thousands of people" in the gas-chambers at Buchenwald . . . which were non-existent, and numerous "witnesses" again declared at the Eichmann trial at Jerusalem that they had seen deportees at Bergen-Belsen setting out for the gas-chambers.

As far as the Polish camps occupied by the Germans are concerned, the sole document attesting the existence and utilisation of gas-chambers at Chemno, Belzec, Maidanek, Sobidor and Treblinka comes from a nian named Kurt Gerstein. Drawn up in French by this ex-Waffen SS man—we will never know why since the man in question "committed suicide" in his cell after composing this peculiar confession—the document was considered of such doubtful authenticity from the moment it appeared that, produced at Nuremberg on the 30th January 1946, it was not admitted by the Court, and not included in the charge against the accused. This did not prevent the Press from upholding it as authentic, and it continues to circulate in three different versions—two in French and one in German—which moreover do not agree with each other. The latter version featured in the Eichmann trial at Jerusalem in 1961. Bad faith, as we see, dies hard.

It is probable that there was a gas-chamber in existence at Belzec. At Auschwitz, on the other hand, it seems to have been established that there was one in existence and functioning; a great deal of evidence exists, but it is so often divergent and contradictory that it is difficult to disentangle the truth. If any such chambers were in operation at Auschwitz, it can only have been from the 20th February 1943, when they were completed, until the 17th November 1944—in other words, for seventeen to eighteen months, from which a certain number of months must be deducted since, according to the report of Dr. Rezso Kasztner, president of the Committee for the Salvation of the Jews of Budapest from 1942 to 1945, these chambers were out of operation from the autumn of 1943 to May 1944.

It would be difficult to form any idea of the number of victims who are said to have passed through these chambers, since no exact and credible assessments appear to have been made, and the accounts given by the various witnesses are more akin to the realm of extravagance than reality. So many "witnesses" have "committed suicide"—or been forced to do so—and so many others have died who perhaps never even existed, that it is impossible to lend faith to their statements; for what strikes one more forcibly than anything else upon attempting to discover precise evidence and the original documents is the way in which both of these sources, whose sole factor in common is their "good faith", have "disappeared".

Rassinier's study clearly shows that if Hitler's Germany was racist and did not, as such, consider the Jews as nationals, that she did not, in the beginning at least, wish to exterminate the Jews, but to place them outside the national community—which is precisely what the State of Israel did when she drove back into Jordan 900,000 Arabs who had been living in Palestine.

"Germany under Hitler was a racist State. Now, as we know, (the theory of) the racist State postulates the expulsion of minority races outside the frontiers of the national community. The State of Israel is another example of this assumption.

"According to Article 4 of the twenty-five point programme of the National Socialist Party published in Munich on the 24th February 1920, 'Only a patriot can be a citizen. Only a person who has German blood in his veins, irrespective of his religion, can be a patriot. A Jew cannot be a patriot. . . .'

"Article 5 concluded: 'A person who is not a citizen can only live in Germany as a guest and is subject to the legislation for aliens.'

"When National Socialism came to power on the 30th February

1933, the German Jews automatically became subject to the Statute of Aliens, which in every country of the world excludes foreigners from positions of influence in the State or the Economy. Such is the juridical foundation of the racial laws in Hitler's Germany. . . .

"The only difference between Germany under Hitler and other States, is that in the latter one is a foreigner by virtue of one's nationality, whereas under National Socialism a foreigner was classified by virtue of his race. But in Israel Arabs no longer teach, or work in the Treasury, or administer a kibbutz, or become Ministers of State. What is happening in Israel does not justify what has happened in Germany, I agree—doubtless because one wrong does not right another—but I am not attempting to justify, I am offering an explanation, and to do so I am taking a mechanism to pieces: if I quote Israel, it is only to show at the same time that the evil of racialism in the sense in which National Socialism understood the word is much greater than is generally believed, since the champions of anti-racialism have today become its protagonists and, contrary to popular opinion, Hitler's Germany is not, so to speak, its only example."

(P. Rassinier, *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann*, pp. 100-101)

The promulgation of the racial laws after the Congress of Nuremberg in September 1935 led the German Government into negotiations seeking to transfer the Jews to Palestine on the basis of the Balfour Declaration. When this failed, the government asked other countries to take charge of them. They refused.

"Since there was no Jewish State with which to draw up a bilateral agreement or international treaty on the model of Geneva or the Hague, and since, despite reiterated offers from the National Socialist Government, not a single country had agreed either to permit them to immigrate or to take them under their wing, they lived in Germany until the declaration of war enjoying the status of stateless foreigners, which was no guarantee to the safety of their persons, since, as such people all over the world are, they were at the mercy of those in power." (P. Rassinier, *ibid.*, p. 20)

It was only in November 1938, after the assassination of von Rath, the Councillor of the German Embassy in Paris, by Grynspan, who was Jewish—a crime which provoked violent anti-Jewish reaction in Germany—that the leaders of the Third Reich proposed the introduction of an over-all solution to the Jewish problem and re-launched the idea of transferring them to Palestine. The project,

which had dragged on since 1933, broke down because Germany could not negotiate their departure on the basis of 3,000,000 marks, as demanded by Britain, without some agreement for compensation. Moreover Germany was unable to negotiate the emigration of the Jews on a massive scale with other countries, since they refused to establish import-export agreements in compensation which would have made emigration possible. France likewise, at the end of 1940, did not agree to their transfer to Madagascar:

"After the defeat of France and the failure to conclude peace with England, the German leaders conceived the idea that the Jews could be gathered together and then transferred to a French colonial territory, for example, Madagascar. In a report on the 21st August 1942, the Secretary of State for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Third Reich, Luther, decided that it would be possible to negotiate with France in this direction and described conversations which had taken place between July and December 1940, and which were brought to a halt following the interview with Montoire on 13th December 1940 by Pierre-Étienne Flandin, Laval's successor. During the whole of 1941 the Germans hoped that they would be able to reopen these negotiations and bring them to a happy conclusion." (P. Rassinier, *ibid.*, p. 108)

It was only after successive rebuffs, and for several other reasons, as we shall see, that Germany's attitude in relation to the Jews hardened.

First of all, there was the letter sent by Chaim Weizmann, President of the Jewish Agency, to Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain, in which he informed him that "we Jews are on the side of Great Britain and will fight for democracy". It was published in the *Jewish Chronicle* of the 5th September 1939 and constituted a veritable declaration of war by World Jewry against Germany.

Earlier Leon Blum had urged the democracies to destroy the racist ideology in an article which was published in *Paris-Soir* on the 23rd March 1939:

"The re-organisation, the reconciliation and the co-operation of all the States in the world that are attached to liberty and peace, and the stimulation and exaltation of the democratic system, and at the same time the systematic destruction of the racist ideology, that is the essential task incumbent on the great movements of public opinion, without which the governments would be impotent."

The Jewish writer Emil Ludwig, a naturalised Swiss of German origin, who was decorated with the Légion d'Honneur by the French

Government in April 1939, launched an appeal with a great deal of to-do about the same time "for a new Holy Alliance to be concluded between the three great democracies of the world", and scarcely disguised the invitation to war:

"... the influence of the United States in this alliance will be the decisive factor. Because this new alliance is first and foremost designed as a threat and a deterrent, the chief role falls to America. . . . (E. Ludwig: *A New Holy Alliance*, p. 94)

"All countries may join the new Holy Alliance . . . among the Great Powers the Soviet Union will be the first. . . . (p. 101). The national philosophy will decide whether or not a state is to be admitted into the alliance . . . the alliance is directed against Germany, Italy and similar states which might adopt such principles at any moment . . . it issues its challenge in even more forceful language than that of the dictators. (p. 104)

for

"... the political aims of this century are: socialism as the national expedient, and the United States of Europe as the international policy. Is it possible to reach both goals without war? . . ." (p. 120)

It seems hardly likely, and Ludwig makes no attempt to disguise the fact, since he concludes his appeal with the words:

"Religions, philosophies, ideals have always been formulated and guarded by solitary thinkers. But they have always been defended by armed men, at the peril of their lives."

(E. Ludwig, *ibid.*, p. 123)

To return to the position of the Jews in Germany.

"In September 1939, from the very moment hostilities began, the authorities representing the World Jewish Congress, as if to reproach England and France with having delayed so long, recalled that 'the Jews of the entire world had declared economic and financial war on Germany as early as 1933' and that they had 'resolved to carry this war of destruction through to the end', and at the same time they authorised Hitler to place all those to hand in concentration camps, which is the way countries all over the world treat enemy aliens in time of war. As events developed the European Jews found themselves in the same boat as their brethren in Germany, and when there was no longer any hope of their emigrating outside Europe—and the last chance vanished with the failure of the Madagascar plan at the end of 1940—it was

decided to regroup them and to put them to work in one immense ghetto which, after the successful invasion of Russia, was situated towards the end of 1941 in the so-called Eastern territories near the former frontier between Russia and Poland: at Auschwitz, Chelmno, Belzec, Maidanek, Treblinka, etc. . . . There they were to wait until the end of the war for the re-opening of international discussions which would decide their fate. This decision was finally reached at the famous interministerial Berlin-Wannsee conference which was held on the 20th January 1942, and the transfer had commenced in March."

(P. Rassinier, *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann*, p. 20)

Then came the declaration of war against Russia, the massive bombardment of Dresden, Leipzig and Hamburg, and lastly the publication of a book by an American Jew, Theodor N. Kaufman, called *Germany must perish*:

"In his book, Kaufman flatly states that Germans, solely because they are Germans, do not deserve to live . . . and that after the war 25,000 doctors will be mobilised and each will be given 25 German men or women to sterilise every day, so that in three months there would not be a single German alive in Europe capable of reproduction and in sixty years the German race would be totally eliminated from the continent. He said, moreover, that the German Jews shared his view.

"Hitler ordered this book to be broadcast over all German radio stations, and one can imagine the effect it produced on the German public."

(P. Rassinier, pp. 108-109)

Finally let us deal with the Morgenthau plan.

This scheme, which had been drawn up in the United States by Henry Morgenthau, one of Roosevelt's advisers, and Harry Dexter White (both men were Jewish, the latter of Eastern European origin), provided for the complete destruction of German industry and the definite transformation of Germany into an agricultural country.

It was approved at the Quebec Conference of 1943, and as soon as the war was ended the Allies put it into operation and began dismantling the factories in the Ruhr. It was quickly realised that it was completely senseless and abandoned. Meanwhile Harry Dexter White had been discovered to be a Soviet agent. He died of a heart attack the day before he was due to be arrested.

But with reference to Germany; in the face of the Morgenthau plan, the Kaufman plan, the declaration by Chaim Weizmann and the World Jewish Congress of war to the bitter end, the declaration

of Casablanca confirming the decision to accept only an unconditional surrender, the campaign of terror-bombing of the civilian population of German towns (135,000 died at Dresden), the Germans were now convinced that the Allies had decided on their extermination, and in these conditions one is not surprised to find that the Jews collected in the camps served as hostages and that terrible reprisals fell upon them.

It was in these circumstances that there commenced the massive and brutal deportation of Jews towards the Polish camps, particularly Auschwitz.

To bring this chapter to a conclusion, we wish to quote the evidence of a Jewish witness, the importance of which will not escape the reader. In the issue of 15th December 1960 of *La Terre Retrouvée*, Doctor Kubovy, director of the Centre Mondial de Documentation Juive Contemporaine at Tel-Aviv, recognised that no order for extermination exists from Hitler, Himmler, Heydrich or Goering (Rassinier: *Le Drame des Juifs Européens*, pp. 31, 39). It would seem then that the exterminations by gas were the work of regional authorities and a few sadistic Germans.

According to Rassinier, the exaggeration in the calculation of the number of victims is inspired by a purely material problem:

" . . . It is simply a question of justifying by a proportionate number of corpses the enormous subsidies which Germany has been paying annually since the end of the war to the State of Israel by way of reparation for injuries which moreover she cannot be held to have caused her either morally or legally, since there was no State of Israel at the time the incriminating deeds took place; thus it is a purely and contemptibly material problem.

"Perhaps I may be allowed to recall here that the State of Israel was only founded in May 1948 and that the Jewish victims in Germany were nationals of many States with the exception of Israel, in order to underline the dimensions of a fraud which defies description in any language; on the one hand Germany pays to Israel sums which are calculated on roughly six million dead, and on the other, as at least four-fifths of these six million were decidedly alive at the end of the war, she is paying substantial sums by way of reparation to the victims of Hitler's Germany to those who are still alive in countries all over the world other than Israel and to the rightful claimants of those who have since deceased, which means that for the former (the six million, i.e.), or in other words, for the vast majority, she is paying twice."

(P. Rassinier: *Le Drame des Juifs Européens*, pp. 31 and 39)

With this we conclude our examination of Rassinier's arguments. Not having made a personal study of this question, we are limited to an examination of this author's conclusions, for which he must bear the full responsibility, but it would seem that the facts and documents which he adds to the dossier of war crimes merit full and impartial investigation. The question of six million Jewish victims who died in Hitler's camps can no longer be considered an article of faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

of works quoted

* indicates foreign works available in the British Museum.

- BATAULT, G. *Le Problème Juif*, 1921. *Israel contre les Nations*, 1939*.
 BENAMOZEGH, E. *Israel et l'Humanité*, 1961*.
 BONSIRVEN, Rev., S.J. *Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ*, 1934.
 COHEN, K. *Nomades*, 1928.
 DE ECCLESIAE. Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, Trans. by T. Atthill, C.T.S., 1966.
 DHORME, E. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*.
 DIMONT, MAX I. *Jews, God and History*, 1964.
 DISRAELI, B. Coningsby, 1849.
 DOENITZ, Admiral. *Ten Years and Twenty Days*, 1959.
 FAURE, E. *L'âme juive*, in *La Question Juive vue par vingt-six éminentes personnalités*, 1934.
 FEJTO, F. *Dieu et son Juif*, 1960*. *Les Juifs et l'Antisémitisme dans les Pays communistes*, 1960.
 FLEG, E. *Israel et Moi*, 1936*.
 GRAETZ, *History of the Jews*.
 ISAAC, J. *Jésus et Israel*, original edition 1946; 1959. *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, original edition 1948; 1956*.
 JEHOUDA, J. *L'Antisémitisme, Miroir du Monde*, 1958*.
 LANE, A. BLISS. *I Saw Poland Betrayed*, 1948.
 LAPOUGE, VACHER DE. *Les Selections sociales*, cours professé à l'Université de Montpellier, 1888-9.
 LAZARE, BERNARD. *Anti-Semitism*, 1903, New York.
 LENIN. *The Proletarian Revolution and Kautsky the Renegade*, 1920.
 LEWISOHN, L. *Israel*, 1926.
 LOEB, I. *La Littérature des Pauvres dans La Bible*.
 LOVSKY, F. *Antisémitisme et Mystère d'Israel*, 1955.
 LUDWIG, E. *A New Holy Alliance*, 1938.
 MADAULE, J. *Les Juifs et le Monde Actuel*, 1963*.
 MASSOUTIÉ, L. *Judaïsme et Hitlerisme*, 1935*. *Judaïsme et Marxisme*, 1939*.
 MEMMI, A. *Portrait of a Jew*, 1963.
 NEUMANN, alias Neuberg. *L'Insurrection armée*.
 NOSSIG, A. *Integrales Judentum*, 1922.
 PASMANIK, Dr. D. *Qu'est-ce que le Judaïsme?* 1930.
 PÉGUY, C. *Notre Jeunesse dans Oeuvres en Prose*, 1909-14.

- PONCINS, LÉON DE. *Le Plan Communiste d'Insurrection Armée*, 1939*. *L'Enigme Communiste*, 1942.
- RABI. *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, 1962*.
- RASSINIER, P. *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse*, 1955*. *Ulysse trahi par les Siens*, 1961*. *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann*, 1962*. *Le Drame des Juifs Européens*, 1964*.
- RENAN, J. E. *The Antichrist*, 1899 (tr. by W. G. Hutchinson).
- ROSENBERG, A. *A History of Bolshevism*, 1934.
- ROUDINESCO, Dr. A. *Le Malheur d'Israel*, 1956.
- SALLUSTE (pseud.) *Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme*, 1930.
- SAROLEA, C. *Impressions of Soviet Russia*, 1924.
- SARTRE, J. P. *Portrait of the Anti-Semite*, 1948.
- SERANT, P. *Les Vaincus de la Liberation*, 1964.
- SOMBART, W. *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, 1913.
- SPIRE, A. *Quelques Juifs et demi-juifs*, 1928*.
- STEED, H. W. *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, 1913.
- THORWALD, J. *Wlassow contre Staline*, 1953.
- TROTSKY, LEV. *The Defence of Terrorism*, 1921.
- VALLAT, X. Article in *Aspects de la France*, 21st January 1965.
- WEBSTER, N. H. *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, 1964.
- WEBSTER, N. H. *World Revolution*, 1921.
- WEBSTER, N. H. *French Revolution*, 1919.

INDEX

- Aaron, 145
- Abel, 57
- Abraham, 55, 155
- Abram, M. B., 172
- Abranavel, J., 118
- Adam, 57
- Adler, 109
- Albigensians, the, 90
- Algazi, L., 12
- Al Gomhuria, 169
- Alliance Israelite Universelle, 140
- Aman, 74
- America, 141
- American Jewish Committee, 135, 140, 141, 167-73
- American Reform Judaism, 34
- Amitiés judéo-chrétiennes, 12, 29, 30, 71, 154
- Amos, 56
- Antichrist, 27
- Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, 168, 170
- Anti-Semitism, 11, 20-22, 34-37, 60, 62, 67, 71, 82-88, 110, 119, 120, 130, 134, 136, 137, 140, 141, 148-50, 153, 154, 160, 162, 168, 170, 173
- Apollonio, U., 159
- Appio, 86
- Apro, A., 108
- Artaxerxes, 74
- Aspects de la France*, 49
- Assuerus, 74
- Atheism, 36, 49, 119, 125, 172
- Auschwitz, 11, 18, 22, 28, 32, 150, 181, 182, 184, 188, 189
- Azef, 109
- Balachowsky, Prof., 180
- Balfour Declaration, 70, 185
- Barabbas, 17, 146, 147
- Baron, Prof. S., 182
- Barruel, Abbé, 166
- Bartolucci, 117
- Batault, G., 48, 78-80, 88, 90, 112, 152, 158
- Baum, Father, 161, 169
- Bea, Cardinal, meets Jules Isaac, 12; commissioned by Pope to study his suggestions, 13; in favour of the schema on the Jews, 133; attacks upon by anti-Semitic tracts, 137-41, 161, 164, 165; an exegete, his love of men and justice, 153; his relations with B'nai B'rith, AJC, and other world Jewish organisations, from the article in *Look* magazine, 167-74
- Belzec, 183, 184, 188
- Benamozegh, E., 32, 37, 38, 88, 121, 122, 130
- Benda, J., 98
- Bergen-Belsen, 183
- Beria, 98
- Berman, J., 108
- Bernadotte, Count, 110
- "Bernardus", 161
- Berzine, 107
- Birobidjan, 75
- Blaha, Dr., 180, 183
- Bloch, M., 62
- Blum, L., 95, 129, 186
- B'nai B'rith, 10, 31, 34, 35, 130, 140, 160, 161, 164, 167, 168, 170, 172-4
- Boerne, L., 62, 117
- Bolshevism, 104, 106, 107
- Bonsirven, Rev. S. J., 47
- Borodin, 106
- Boudnitchenko, Colonel, 98

Buber-Neuman, M., 100
 Buchenwald, 97, 180, 182, 183
 Buddhism, 138
 Buxtorf, 117
 Bykadorov, Captain, 99

Cabbalism, the Cabbala, 36, 77, 115, 118, 121
 Caiaphas, 17, 39
 Cain, 21, 57
 Calvin, 36, 118, 160
 Carli, Mgr., 133-5, 142, 144, 145, 147, 150-2, 155, 157, 171, 172
 Casablanca, the declaration of, 189
 Catholicus, 161
 Catholicism, the attack on the traditional form of, 11, 33, 35, 37, 49, 50, 69, 76, 150
 Celsus, 116
 Centre Mondial de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, 178, 183, 189
 Centre de Documentation Juive de Paris, 182
 Chamberlain, 186
 Chaplin, C., 80
 Chemno, 183
 Chiang Kai-shek, 106
 Chizuk Emuna, 117
 Churchill, 144
 Cicero, 86
 Cicognani, Cardinal, 162
 Claudius, Emperor, 152
 Clement III, 92
 Clement VIII, 92
 Coetus internationalis patrum, 134
 Cohen, Kadmi, 92-95, 129
 Collective responsibility, the principle of, 97, 144-6, 148, 167
 Committee for the Salvation of the Jews of Budapest, 184
 Commission Théologique de L'Oeuvre Evangelique suisse, 73
 Common Sense, 161, 164
 Communism, 36, 68, 119, 124, 128, 152, 159, 160, 162, 164, 172

Conference of European Rabbis in Great Britain, 1960, 50
 Congar, Father, 9
 Contempt, "the teaching of contempt", 12, 14, 21, 24, 27, 150, 174
 Conversion, to Christianity, 31, 37, 39, 54, 55, 58, 59-62, 73, 76, 90, 114, 115, 157, 171; to monotheism, Judaism, 35, 38, 78, 79, 114, 115, 120-2
 Corriere della Sera, 139
 Constantine, Emperor, 113, 114
 Council of Trent, 25
 Cushing, Cardinal, 171

Dachau, 179, 180, 182, 183
 Daniel, 56
 Daniel, Father, 49
 Daniélou, Father, 12
 Darmesteter, 80, 111, 116, 120, 129
 Declaration of Moscow, 1943, 51
 De Ecclesiae, The Declaration on the Relation of the Church to non-Christian Religions, 9, 10, 13, 33, 130, 133-7; the text of the final form of, 140, 143, 144, 149, 155, 165, 167, 171
 Deicide, the deicide charge, 15, 21, 23, 134, 135, 139, 142-5, 163, 164, 169, 170
 Delo, 100
 Demann, Father, 12
 Deutero-Isaiah, 56, 79
 Deuteronomy, 91
 Deutsch, H., 40-42
 Dhorme, E., 92
 Dimont, M. I., 10, 53, 73, 77, 90, 91, 130
 Disraeli, B., 93, 117
 Djerdjinsky, 106
 Doenitz, Grand Admiral, 51, 106
 Dora, 182, 183
 Dostoevsky, 177
 Dresden, the destruction of, 188, 189
 Dreyfus affair, 70, 88

Ecumenism, 31, 33, 157, 170
 Edict of Nantes, 62

Ehrenburg, I., 106
 Eichmann, A., 51, 181-3
 Einstein, 77, 80
 Eisendrath, Rabbi M., 34
 Eisenmenger, J. A., 86
 Eisner, K., 104
 Eitani, R., 49
 Elias, 78
 Engels, 103-105
 Esraism, 54
 Esther, 74
 Exodus, 56
 Ezekiel, 54, 56, 78, 145

Farkas, M., 109
 Farkas, W., 109
 Faure, E., 68, 69, 76-78, 81, 83-85, 130
 Fejtö, F., 56, 57, 67, 68, 75, 108, 114, 115
 Felici, Mgr., 162
 Feltin, Cardinal, 34
 Fenyes, 109
 Fesquet, H., 9, 133, 136, 153
 Le Figaro, 51, 133, 134, 137, 141, 147, 154, 172, 179
 Fineberg, 109
 Flandin, P. E., 186
 Fleg, E., 12, 130
 France-Soir, 134
 Frederick, Emperor, 116
 Freemasonry, 160, 162, 164
 French Revolution, 35, 36, 65, 71, 116, 117, 119, 166
 Freud, 77, 80
 Freudenberg, Pastor, 12
 Friends, The, of Jules Isaac, 29

Galen, alias General Blücher, 106
 Gaulle, General de, 126
 Gemara, 55, 59
 Geouffre de la Pradelle, Maitre Raymond de, 51
 Gerlier, Cardinal, 34, 154
 Gero, 108
 Gerstein, K., 183
 Gnostics, 86
 Goering, Field-Marshal, 101, 189
 Goldberg, A. J., 171

Goldmann, N., 10, 47, 71, 72, 168
 Graetz, 61, 62, 119
 Grebnjakov, V., alias Dora, 101
 Grynspan, 110, 185
 Guershouni, 109

Hagada, 55
 Halaka, 55
 Hamburg, the destruction of, 188
 Hanan, 17
 Hatvany, Baron, 41
 Haussner, G., 181
 Hegira, the, 38
 Heine, H., 62, 102, 117, 129
 Heschel, Rabbi A. J., 168, 171, 173
 Hess, R., 180, 181
 Heydrich, 189
 Higgins, Mgr. G., 171, 172
 Hilberg, P., 178, 180, 183
 Himmler, 189
 Hitler, A., 19, 32, 48, 70, 87, 88, 92, 95, 97, 100, 101, 144, 148, 150, 152, 170, 182, 184, 185, 187, 189, 190
 Hochhuth, R., 170, 181
 Hoelbrigel, 180
 Hoettl, 180
 Holmogor, 101
 Holtzmann, 109
 Homer, 77
 Honorius III, 91
 Hosea, 56

Impropria, suppression of the prayer of, 33
 Inquisition, the, 62, 72, 90, 91
 Institute of Contemporary History, Munich, 183
 International Institute to Study the Jewish Question, suggestion of the foundation of, 176
 Isaac, Jules, 10; the gist of his thesis, 11, 12; organises Judaeo-Christian dialogues and had private audiences with Pius XII and John XXIII, 12; the result, 13; his revised version of the Gospels, 14-19, of the Church Fathers, 20-22, and of the Doctors of the Church, 22-

- 28; his demands of the Council, 29; supported in Catholic circles, 29, 30; his visit to Rome, 31-33; H. Deutsch intervenes on behalf of with Paul VI, 40, 41; 82, 86, 111, 112, 114, 116, 130, 140, 144, 148-50, 152-4, 163, 165, 167; the author's thesis of influence of on declaration on Judaism in Vatican Council II confirmed in *Look* article, 167, 168; 181
- Isaiah, 54, 56, 78, 155
- Islam, 90, 138
- Israel, the State of, 48-51, 148, 184, 185, 189
- Jackson, Justice, 179, 182
- Jacob, P., 34
- Jankélévitch, V., 96, 148, 181
- Janson, 107
- Jehouda, J., 30-32, 34-38, 47, 71, 73, 82, 85, 115, 117-20, 129, 140, 154, 157, 163
- Jehovah, Jahve, Jahweh, 20, 56, 57, 89, 112
- Jeremiah, 54, 56, 78
- Jesus, 14-18, 21, 26, 39, 40, 55, 58, 77, 115, 117, 122, 125, 134, 143, 145-7, 150, 151, 156, 162, 170, 174
- Jewish Chronicle*, 186
- John XXIII, 12, 30, 136, 161, 164, 168-70
- Joshua, 56
- Jullie, Cardinal, 12
- Juvenal, 86
- Kaplan, Grand Rabbi J., 12, 135, 142, 148
- Kasztner, Dr. R., 184
- Katyn Forest Murder, 101
- Katz, L., 10, 34
- Kaufman, Dr. T. N., 188
- Kautsky, Dr., 180
- Kautsky, K., 102
- Kellner, H. M., 160
- Kennedy, President J. F., 110
- Keri, 109
- Kibbutz mapam, 49
- Kiziewicz, General, 108
- Klauzner, J., 39, 115
- Klyber, Father, 161
- Koestler, 73
- Korherr, Dr., 182
- Krasnov, General, 99
- Krasnov, Colonel S., 99
- Krausnik, H., 180
- Kubovy, Dr., 189
- Kuhn, Bela, 104, 106, 107, 109
- Lagrange, Father, 112
- Lane, A. Bliss, 108
- Lapine, Captain, 99
- Laptchinski, Lieut., 99
- Lassalle, F., 102, 117
- Lateran Council, the Fourth, 91
- Lattés, S., 12
- Laurentin, Abbé, R., 134, 135, 147, 154, 172
- Laval, 186
- Lazare, B., 54, 55, 57, 58, 80, 83, 84, 93, 102, 117, 129
- Lazareff, P., 134
- Lefebvre, Mgr., 133
- Leipzig, the destruction of, 188
- Lemkin, Prof. R., 180
- Lenin, 75, 105
- Leo XIII, 97, 136
- Leroy-Beaulieu, A., 63
- Lewisohn, L., 65, 66, 129
- Lichten, J., 170, 172
- Liebnecht, 102, 104
- Liénart, Cardinal, 12, 34, 154
- Lieven, M., 104
- Litvinoff, M., alias Wallach, etc., 109
- Loeb, I., 79, 80
- Look*, article "How the Jews changed Catholic Thinking", 167-73
- Lopinot, Father C., 12
- Losovsky, 107
- Louis XIV, 116
- Lovsky, Prof. F., 12, 50, 60, 74, 92, 121
- Ludwig, E., 129, 186
- Lukacs, G., 108

- Lunel, 29
- Luther, 36, 76, 86, 118
- Luther, Secretary of State for the Third Reich, 186
- Luxembourg, Rosa, 102, 104
- Madaule, J., 12, 47-50, 71, 76
- Madagascar, 186, 187
- Maidanek, 183, 188
- Maimonides, Moses, 80
- Malachi, 38
- Malychkine, General, 99
- Mao Tse-tung, 106
- Manicheans, 86
- Marrou, H., 12
- Martin, J., 12
- Martin V, 91
- Marx, K., 37, 68, 76, 77, 81, 102-105, 117
- Marxism, 67, 75, 87, 100, 102, 103, 116, 152
- Massoutié, L., 61-63, 86
- Mathausen, 183
- Mauclair, 161
- Maxentius, 113
- Maximos IV, Patriarch, 141
- Meandrov, General, 99
- Memmi, A., 32, 37, 123-8, 130
- Mendelssohn, M., 69
- Il Messaggero de Roma*, 143
- Messiah, messianism, 30, 31, 37, 39, 55, 58, 71, 102, 113, 115, 120-2, 143, 146, 156, 174
- Micah, 56
- Mihajlov, 100, 101
- Militant Servants of Our Lady of Fatima, 161
- Minc, 108
- Mishna, 53-55, 59
- Le Monde*, 9, 34, 40, 51, 71, 72, 96, 100, 101, 133, 135, 137, 139, 143, 148, 153, 154, 181
- Monotheism, 30-32, 34, 35, 37, 56, 77, 89, 119, 120, 157
- Montaigne, 80
- Montini, Archbishop of Milan, 170
- Montoire, 186
- Morgenthau Plan, 188
- Morlion, Father, F., 173
- Moses, Mosaic Law, 53-56, 77, 91, 92, 134, 145, 155, 156
- Mouret, 29
- Moyné, Lord, 110
- Nantet, J., 12
- National Catholic Welfare Conference, 170, 171
- Nebuchadnezzar, 93
- Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, 103
- Neuhäussler, Mgr., 179
- Neumann, alias Neuberg, 104, 105, 107
- Nicholas, I, 136
- Niemöller, Pastor, M., 179
- Nietzsche, 37
- Nieuwenhuys, D., 104
- Nizzachon, 117
- Nossig, Rabbi A., 64, 65, 76, 129
- Nuremberg trial, 139, 144, 148, 178-83
- Nyizli, Dr. M., 181
- Oesterreicher, Father, 161, 169
- Official Report of the Portuguese Government to the Committee of Non-Intervention, 107
- Oikoumenikon*, 151
- Origen, 59, 116
- Osservatore della Domenica*, 162, 167
- Osservatore Romano*, 143, 159, 162, 165
- Oswald, L., 110
- Ottaviani, Cardinal, 12
- Palanque, Father, 29, 30
- Palestra del Clero*, 134, 142, 144, 146, 151, 152, 155, 157
- Pange, J. de, 102
- Paris-Match*, 181
- Paris-Presse*, 41, 137, 147
- Paris-Soir*, 95, 186
- Parry, 117
- Patriarch of Antioch, 136
- Pasmanik, D., 46, 47, 70, 77
- Paul IV, 92
- Paul VI, 40, 41, 133, 135, 137, 138, 161, 165, 167, 170-2, 174

Pauker, A., 108
 Péguy, C., 93
 Pentateuch, 53
 Peter, G., 109
 Petlioura, H., 110
 Pfeifferkorn, J., 36, 118, 119
 Pharaohs, The, 93
 Pharisees, The, 53-55, 59, 113, 117
 Philostrates, 89
 Pico de Mirandola, 36, 118
 Pilate, Pontius, 15-18, 84, 146
 Pinay, M., 160, 163, 168
 Piperno, Dr. S., 143
 Pius XII, 12, 168, 170
 Plehve, 109
 Pogany, 109
 Poliakov, L., 180
 Poncins, Leon de, 104, 106, 134, 136, 153, 161, 164
 Pravda, 104
 Primao, R., (or Primakoff), 107
 Protestantism, 62, 76, 86, 139
 Proust, M., 80
 Provençhères, Mgr. de, 29, 30, 153, 154, 167
 Psalms, 155
 Quebec Conference, 188
 Rabi, 32, 33, 37, 39, 47, 50, 71, 102, 115, 121, 130
 Radkiewicz, 108
 Rakosi, 108
 Rassinier, P., 97, 100, 101, 178, 180-6, 188-90
 Rath, von, 110, 185
 Rathenau, W., 129
 Reformation, The, 35, 36, 76, 80, 116-19
 Reinach, S., 80
 Reiter, A., 157
 Renaissance, The, 35, 36, 80, 116-19
 Renan, E., 85
 Renard, Abbé, J.-P., 180, 183
 Reuchlin, J., 36, 118
 Revai, 108
 Revue des Deux Mondes, 101
 Richard the Lion-Hearted, 80
 Robison, Prof., 166
 Roddy, J., 167

Roosevelt, 188
 Rosenberg, A., 102
 Rosenbergs, The, 69
 Rothschilds, 41
 Roudinesco, Dr. A., 46, 55, 56, 59, 60, 66, 69, 70, 83, 87, 88, 91, 122
 Routenberg, 109
 Rubinstein, J., 110
 Rudenko, General, 101
 Ruppin, A., 182
 Sadducees, 53
 St. Agobard, 11, 25, 27, 28, 33, 149
 St. Ambrose, 11, 22, 27, 33
 St. Thomas Aquinas, 92
 St. Augustine, 11, 21-25, 28, 33, 59, 130, 149, 150
 St. Avit, 60, 74
 St. John Chrysostom, 11, 22, 23, 25, 28, 33, 130, 149, 150
 St. Clement of Alexandria, 59
 St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 22
 St. Ephrem, 22
 St. Epiphany, 22
 St. Francis of Assisi, 80
 Pope St. Gregory the Great, 11, 25, 28, 33, 130, 149, 150
 St. Gregory of Nyssa, 22
 St. Hilary of Poitiers, 22
 St. Joan of Arc, 128
 St. Jerome, 22, 59
 St. John, 14, 16, 17, 33, 140, 143, 145, 168
 St. Luke, 14-16, 40, 155, 168
 St. Mark, 14, 16, 40, 168
 St. Matthew, 14-17, 19, 29, 33, 40, 113, 140, 145-7, 168
 St. Paul, 20, 25, 68, 77, 78, 81, 151, 155, 156
 St. Peter, 139, 151
 Pope St. Pius V, 92
 Salluste, 76
 Sarolea, C., 103, 104, 107
 Sartre, J. P., 67
 Satan, 23, 27, 28, 162, 173
 Scarioli, N., 100
 Scemama, A., 71, 72
 Schourski, 29

Schuster, Z., 141, 171, 172
 Schwartzbart, 110
 Schweitzer, M., 109
 Secretariat for Christian Unity, 161, 164, 169, 172
 Seelisberg, the Ten Points of, 12
 Seneca, 86
 Sepher Toledot Jeschu, 28
 Scrant, P., 97, 98
 Sergius, Grand Duke, 109
 Sérot, Colonel, 110
 Shapiro, M., 49
 Sigaud, Mgr. de Proenca, 133
 Silberberg, 109
 Simon the Magician, 139
 Slansky, 69, 108
 Sobidor, 183
 Socialism, 104
 Soekarno, President, 138
 Sombart, W., 61, 62, 77
 Spanish Revolution, 107
 Specht, alias Olszewski, 108
 Spinoza, 31, 77, 80
 Spire, A., 71, 111, 116, 120, 130
 Spsychalski, 108
 Stalin, 68, 103
 Statute of London, 1945, 51
 Steed, H. W., 45, 46, 53, 64, 65, 73, 149
 Steinberg, A., 50
 Stolypine, 109
 Streicher, 23, 28, 32, 150
 Stiirkh, Count, 109
 Szamuely, 104
 Synagogue, the, 26-28, 53, 66, 77, 86, 91, 114, 120
 The Tablet, 10, 170
 Tacitus, 86, 112
 The Talmud, 36, 39, 53, 54-56, 58, 59, 90, 102, 115, 117-20, 156, 157, 163
 Tappouni, Cardinal, 147
 Tcherkassy, General Prince B., 99
 Terre de Provence, 29
 La Terre retrouvée, 157, 174, 189
 Times, the New York, 170-2
 Tisserand, Cardinal, 12
 Tiza, Count, 109

Toaff, E., Chief Rabbi of Rome, 143, 171
 Togliatti, 124
 Toldoth Jesho, 117
 Tolstoi, Count Ivan, 100
 Tollier, V., 25
 Torah, 53, 54, 56, 58
 Torquemada, 63
 Toulat, Abbé, 154
 Toussenet, 87
 Treblinka, 183, 188
 Trotsky, L., 104, 105
 Troukhine, General, 99
 Union of Jewish Congregations in America, 34
 United States of Europe, 187
 U.N.O., 162, 172
 Uritski, M., 107
 Vacher de Lapouge, 83
 Vallat, X., 49
 Vas, 108
 Vichy, the Government of, 48, 49
 Vieillard, Abbé, 12
 Vita, 100
 Voltaire, 87, 116, 117
 Wagenseil, 117
 Wallach, M. G. M., alias Buchmann, Finkelstein, Harrison and Litvinoff, 109
 Webster, N. H., 165, 166
 Weigel, Rev. S. J., 141
 Weizmann, Chaim, 186, 188
 White, H. D., 188
 Wildenbruch, von Pieffer, 41
 Wilke, F., 41
 Wiscelicensy, 180
 Wlassow, General, 98-100
 Wolf, 117
 World Jewish Congress, 10, 31, 34, 35, 130, 140, 168, 179, 187, 188
 World Zionist Organisation, 47, 71, 72
 Yourowski, J., 106
 Zaga, E. di, 134, 136, 161
 Zionism, 67, 69-72, 141, 142
 Zoroaster, 86
 Zwingli, 118, 160

FREEMASONRY and the VATICAN

A STRUGGLE FOR RECOGNITION

Translated from the French of

VICOMTE LEON DE PONCINS

by Timothy Tindal-Robertson

WHEREAS before the war it was little known or discussed, Freemasonry today commands an ever-growing and informed audience which has called forth much serious literature and has even provoked television documentary films which have aroused widespread interest.

Freemasonry and the Vatican is the latest book dealing with an entirely new phase in the orientation of Masonry in the modern world. There is at present in Catholic circles a constant, subtle and determined campaign in favour of Freemasonry. It is directed by the progressive element which is currently enjoying a great influence in French and American Church circles and beginning to show its hand in England too. Its avowed object is to obtain from the Vatican the revision or even annulment of the various condemnations pronounced by the Popes upon the Craft since 1738. This element consists of a number of priests, including a Jesuit, Editors of Catholic newspapers and several writers of note.

In this new work, Vicomte de Poncins emphatically reinforces the Church's condemnations of Freemasonry, which, as he shows, have been renewed more than six times since the Second World War and he quotes from authoritative Masonic documents, hitherto unknown to the English reader. Although the author is mainly concerned with Grand Orient Freemasonry, he treats in some detail the question of Masonic Regularity and Irregularity and the oft-disputed relationship of the Anglo-Saxon with the Grand Orient Obediences, and brings to light startling and valuable new evidence on the origins of Anderson's Constitutions and the Grand Lodge of England.

The most important part of the book is concerned with Freemasonry's relationship with politics and in particular its connection, often quite unconscious, with Communism. The author shows the peculiar and disturbing nature of this role in the light of the highest Masonic authorities, and reveals its activity in the French Revolution, the Treaty of Versailles after the First World War, the Cartel des Gauches in France in 1924 and then in the Spanish Civil War.

Freemasonry and the Vatican reveals for the first time that it was the Grand Orient Freemason, Dr. Benes of Czechoslovakia, who influenced the Masonic President Roosevelt to place blind faith in Stalin with the disastrous results to Christian civilisation now known to the World. The reader will be appalled at the extent to which secret and Masonic forces influenced such conferences as that at Yalta and are operating in international politics at the present time. Vicomte de Poncins quotes in full a document discovered by the Spanish Government—known as the 'Zabrowsky Letter,' and written by Roosevelt to the Jewish liaison officer between himself and Stalin. Written in 1943, it reveals how Roosevelt declared his intention of abandoning virtually the whole of Europe and Asia to the Soviets.

Problems as profound as these are not readily capable of solution, and it is a mark of the author's success, that throughout the forty years he has studied them, the documents and authorities on which his conclusions are based have never been challenged and that he himself has won world wide renown for the penetrating depth of his knowledge. Freemasonry and the Vatican is his latest and perhaps the most brilliant and comprehensive study he has written.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

- 1928 Les Forces Secretees de la Revolution
- 1931 Refuse par la Presse
- 1932 La Franc-Maconnerie, Puissance Occulte Les Juifs Maitres du Monde
- 1934 Tempete sur le Monde
- La Franc-Maconnerie d'apres ses documents secrets
- 1936 Le Portugal Renait
- La Societe des Nations, Super-Etat Maconnique
- La Mysterieuse Internationale Juive
- La Guerre Occulte (in collaboration with E. Malynski)
- 1937 Histoire Secrete de la Revolution Espagnole
- 1939 Le Plan Communiste d'Insurrection Armee
- 1941 La Franc-Maconnerie contre la France
- 1942 L'Enigme Communiste Israel Destructeur d'Empires
- 1943 Les Forces Occultes dans le Monde Moderne
- 1961 Espions Sovietiques dans le Monde

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH

- 1929 The Secret Powers Behind Revolution
- 1967 Judaism and the Vatican


LIBERTÉ - ÉGALITÉ - FRATERNITÉ

GRAND ORIENT DE FRANCE

GRANDE LOGE DE FRANCE

16, rue Cadet, Paris

8, rue Poitevin, Paris



CONGRÈS

DES

MAÇONNERIES DES NATIONS ALLIÉES ET NEUTRES

les 28, 29 et 30 Juin 1917

A photograph, from the original in the author's possession, of the cover and title page of the Minutes of the International Masonic Congress of Allied and Neutral Nations, which was held at the headquarters of the Grand Orient of France in Paris on 28th, 29th and 30th June, 1917. An analysis and detailed extracts from this important document appear on pages 51 to 57.

LIBERTÉ — ÉGALITÉ — FRATERNITÉ

GRAND ORIENT

DE FRANCE

16, rue Cadet

PARIS

• 19 •

GRAND LOGE

DE FRANCE

8, rue Puteaux

PARIS

• 19 •

CONGRÈS

des Maçonneries des Nations alliées et neutres

les 28, 29 et 30 Juin 1917

— — —

La Conférence des Maç. des Nations alliées, qui s'est réunie à Paris les 14 et 15 janvier 1917, décidant de convoquer, à Paris, les 28, 29 et 30 juin, un Congrès des Maç. des Nations alliées et neutres.

A cet effet, la pl. suivante a été adressée aux Puissances maç. intéressées

G. O. de France — GRAND-ORIENT — G. L. de France

16, rue Cadet

PARIS

8, rue Puteaux

PARIS

(1) de Paris, le 28 mars 1917 (17-17)

LE G. O. DE FRANCE

En vous transmettant le compte rendu sommaire de la Conférence des Maç. des Nations alliées, qui s'est tenue à Paris les 14-15 jan. 1917 ainsi que les résolutions et le manifeste qu'elle a adoptés, nous vous prions de vous faire connaître que cette Conférence a décidé de tenir, à Paris, au G. O. de France, les 28-29-30 juin prochain un Congrès des Maç. des Nations alliées et neutres.

Le G. O. de France a pour mission de rechercher à cet égard les

The opening page of the Minutes of the International Masonic Congress of Allied and Neutral Nations, a translation of which appears on page 51.

CONTENTS

Chapter	page
1 The Campaign in Favour of Freemasonry	7
2 The Pontifical Condemnations	22
3 The Masonic Secret,	41
4 Judaism and Freemasonry	69
5 Satanism, Naturalism and Freemasonry	79
6 Regularity and Irregularity in Masonry	103
7 Occult Theology and Gnosticism	122
8 Freemasonry and the Revolution of 1789	138
9 Communism and Freemasonry	150
10 Twentieth-century Freemasonry	187
Appendix: Pax and Poland	201
Bibliography	217
Index	219

ILLUSTRATION

1917 Masonic Congress

Frontispiece

"To the crowd we must say: we worship a God, but it is the God one adores without superstition. To you, Sovereign Grand Inspectors General, we say this, that you may repeat it to the brethren of the 32nd, 31st and 30th degrees: all of us initiates of the high degrees should maintain the Masonic religion in the purity of the Luciferian doctrine. If Lucifer were not God, would Adonay, the God of the Christians, whose deeds prove his cruelty, perfidy and hatred of man, his barbarism and repulsion for science, would Adonay and his priests calumniate him? Yes, Lucifer is God, and unfortunately Adonay is also God . . . religious philosophy in its purity and truth consists in the belief in Lucifer, the equal of Adonay."

Albert Pike, quoted in A. C. de la Rive:
La Femme et l'Enfant dans la Franc-Maçonnerie Universelle, p. 588

"The duty of the Knight Rose-Croix is to combat the bastard Gnosticism inherent in Catholicism, which blinds the eyes of faith, turns hope into a pedestal, and charity into egoism . . . the secret teaching of the supreme leaders of Freemasonry may be summed up in these words: to establish the rights of Man, the privation of which constitutes a usurpation against which all means of action are permissible."

La Massoneria, Florence, 1945

"Behind the activity and intrigues of those in the foreground a gigantic struggle is taking place. It is the struggle between angels and devils for the salvation or ruin of mankind. The leader of the infernal spirits is Satan. At the head of the heavenly hosts is the Queen of the Angels, with Saint Michael as her standard-bearer. He who has said no to God has entered the lists against her who has said yes. This is the true sense of the present world happenings and the only philosophy of history that can explain the last causes."

Cardinal Suenens: *Theologie de l'Apostolat*, 1951
pp. 112-214

"Holy Michael the Archangel, defend us in the day of battle; be our safeguard against the wickedness and snares of the devil. May God rebuke him, we humbly pray; and do thou, Prince of the Heavenly Host, by the power of God thrust down into Hell Satan and all wicked spirits who wander through the world for the ruin of souls."

Prayer ordered to be recited after Mass by Pope Leo XIII,
and now discontinued

THE CAMPAIGN IN FAVOUR OF FREEMASONRY

THERE is at present in Catholic circles a constant, subtle and determined campaign in favour of Freemasonry. It is directed by the progressive brigade, currently enjoying so great an influence in France, and is assisted by pressures (whether open or secret) on the part of a considerable number of the clergy—pressures also exerted by the Catholic Press, and even by prelates among the French bishops and cardinals.

Its avowed object is to obtain from the Vatican, and from the Council while it was in session, the revision or, better still, the annulment of the various condemnations pronounced by the Popes upon Freemasonry since 1738. More specifically, its aim is to bring pressure upon the Roman Curia to obtain such an annulment.

The campaign relies for its success upon certain books, cleverly drawn up in such a way as to present Freemasonry in a favourable light, and it commands sources of information and means of propaganda far more extensive than those available to people who defend the traditional position, for newspapers, books, magazines, the radio and public platforms are all open to receive its voice. Furthermore, it receives the tacit support of the Order itself.

To find the first signs of this new tendency, we must go back as far as the twenties. An aged German Jesuit, Father Gruber, an expert on Masonic matters, made contact with three highly-placed Masons, Ossian Lang of New York, and Dr. Kurt Reichl and E. Lehnhof of Vienna, in order to study the possibilities, first of a truce, then of a permanent *modus vivendi*, which would put an end to the furious war which has raged between the Catholic Church and Freemasonry since 1738. These contacts were exceedingly discreet, not to say secret, and they remained virtually unknown to the public at large.

The first public expression of this new attitude took place in 1937. In that year a Mason of high degree—the 33rd—who was also a man of a most independent mind and a writer of quality, Albert Lantoine, published a book which aroused bitter controversy in various quarters. This was his *Lettre au Souverain Pontife*, and the following passages, which have been taken from this work, contain

the gist of his thesis. In his preface to Lantoine's book, the celebrated Freemason Oswald Wirth clearly sets out the basic problem:

"For two centuries the Church and Freemasonry have been at war. On both sides tempers have risen, and troops are mobilised for action, unwilling to suspend hostilities. And yet the leaders do not trouble to hide the fact that it's an absurd conflict proceeding from an unhappy misunderstanding. One can hardly order a sudden about-turn to armies on the field of battle, but is a 'ceasefire' impossible? Could the Pope see his way to giving such a signal? That is the question Albert Lantoine is asking."

(A. Lantoine: *Lettre em Souverain Pontife*, p. ii)

Albert Lantoine in no way shirks the opposition existing between the Church and Freemasonry.

"We are freethinkers—you are believers. Let us not dwell too long on this formidable difference between us. . . .

(A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, p. 53)

". . . This gulf cannot be bridged and never will be. On our side and on yours it has given rise to various hostile acts. The question is: in the face of our common danger today, should we not perhaps silence such expressions of our differences?"

(A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, p. 18)

Lantoine recognises the various premonitions and portents of a world and civilisation that are going to die.

"They multiply upon the rotting corpse of modern society just as Juvenal saw them swarming on the decomposing body of imperial Rome.

(A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, p. 23)

". . . In these sad times in which we live, must those religions which still survive persist in fighting one another with taunts, lies and excommunications? Freemasonry seeks to exalt Man; the Church to exalt God. Must they be rivals? Not at all. In spite of all, they come together. The thinker who will not compromise on what his duty commands, the believer who stands by the demands of his religion: these two are linked—in spirit—over and above the differences between their principles."

(A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, p. 44)

Lantoine, in short, is proposing a truce, and he then launches into a long passage of special pleading, in which he seeks to show that Freemasonry was not, in the beginning, either revolutionary or anti-

religious, but that, on the contrary, it was provoked by the Church and turned into her mortal enemy by the Church's unjust condemnations. As this is the theme which is being taken up again and developed by progressive thinkers today, we will only refer to it in passing.

"The Church's hostility has contributed in large measure to that anti-religious character for which the Masonic Order is known—and which it actually has, at least in Catholic countries. . . .

(A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, p. 81)

". . . Your bulls of excommunication, notwithstanding all the natural and supernatural motives which may have inspired them, were a serious political blunder... (A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, p. 69)

". . . It is your Church—the Roman Church—which has foolishly pushed the Freemasons into the opposing camp. They themselves had no desire to be found there, and I will even say, no matter what wrath I may call down from both sides, that they did not deserve to be sent there. Nevertheless—since honour so demanded !—there they have remained. "They are there now.

"And yet there have come upon us those times of horror foretold in the Scriptures, when the barbarians shall spread over the whole earth like the Fourth Horseman of the Apocalypse. In the face of this upsurge of Instinct, victorious at last over our twin apostolate; in the face of this brute onslaught of those purely materialist appetites which will deal death to all our dreams—should we remain at odds with one another?

"Perhaps.

"Perhaps we should ... in the very depths of our souls. For your God cannot pardon the Rebellious Angel, and that Angel will never submit or renounce his dominion.

"But should we remain enemies?

"No!"

(A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, pp. 91-92)

According to Lantoine, it is part of the onward march of history since the Renaissance that the Catholic Church must fall apart and dissolve. Since this process cannot be reversed, a secular religion must take its place—that is, Freemasonry.

"When she sowed the fateful seed of Equality in the minds of the helots, Christianity sounded the death-knell of all Aristocracies. So it was that she undermined the foundations of Graeco-Latin civilisation, just as the French Revolution, inspired by the same mad charity, pierced the armour of Gallo-Roman society.

" 'Paganism and the Old Regime stood for the Rights of an Elite. Christianity and the Revolution stand for the Rights of Mobs.' In these noble words the philosopher Izoulet notes the degradation—in the exact sense of the word—which your humanitarianism has inflicted on humanity....

"The City of the future foretold in the Gospels has become the City of today. Lenin has fulfilled the hope sown by the Son of Man.

"Let us be fair to Catholicism. She never foresaw such an interpretation of her doctrine. Exalting the humble to abase the proud, ending for good and all that doctrine by which the Inequality of Man seemed an order consecrated by God, she never cherished any insane ambition to destroy social hierarchy, without which no human group—whether family, tribe or nation could subsist....

"The Church believed that those outcasts whom she had emancipated would still, for ever, bow themselves to her discipline—a discipline no longer based on the inequality of men but on the just inequality of functions—a discipline on which was erected that magnificent civilisation of the Middle Ages, still so little known and so unfairly denigrated. But from the day when they first broke away from that discipline, the slaves, whose fetters she had been the first to break, have become slaves totally unfettered, ...

"They all dream of raising themselves to equality with their masters. They prefer equality in slavery to inequality with independence."

(A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, pp. 120-123)

Lantoine concludes that there is an elite on both sides; to save that elite, Catholicism and Freemasonry must work together.

"In a world given over to appetite, any elite is naturally denounced. Its high rank would offend the law of universal mediocrity.

"All the same, this elite remains, among you, among us. Thus, instead of continuing to fight among themselves, ideologies both intellectual and spiritual must coalesce to save Beauty. What does it matter that their opinions differ? In the present hour of distress, both must step down from their mutually exclusive sectarianism, for the presumption shown by rationalism seeking to explain everything is equal to that of religion which will not admit that it is fallible...

(A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, p. 137)

"In this modern world given over to appetite, Freemasonry and the religions remain spiritual forces. Rid them of their trappings

and there remains the undeniable loveliness of their principles. I know they will never agree. The Church has set supernatural limits to truth which we shall for ever repudiate. But even if there is no bridge to link those virtues peculiar to each of us, we can, each along our own path, aspire towards our ideals without hatred. . . .

"Religion, which seeks to purify, and Freemasonry, which seeks to cultivate men's minds, are equally opposed in their respective spheres to unbridled appetite. (A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, pp. 160-163)

"There is a higher sphere where knowledge and Faith, though they cannot meet, can at least tolerate one another. To those seeking the one, to those who possess the other, they give the same delights and the same anguish. There is as much purity and grandeur in the words of the philosophers as in the Word of the Redeemer.

"So much the better, I say. Possessing critical and inquisitive minds, we are the servants of Satan. You, the guardians of truth, are the servants of God. These two complement one another. Each needs the other."
(A. Lantoine, *ibid.*, pp. 168-169)

I do not know whether this sentence was intended by Lantoine to be taken literally, or whether he meant: "In your eyes we are always the servants of Satan." But during a conversation we once had on this matter, which, moreover, was conducted with perfect courtesy, Lantoine said to me: "I was wrong, I didn't use quite the correct term. I should have said servants of Lucifer." I merely reproduce his remark here for what it is worth.

Lantoine was a historian and a thinker of great merit. He was a sincere Freemason, of charming personal character, and he kept apart from all contact with politics. He concealed nothing, and openly declared that he was an atheist. He was severely critical of certain aspects of the Catholic Church but he did not spare Masonry either. He had obviously lost the faith he originally held in democracy and rationalism.

His offer of a truce was frank and honest. It has often happened in history that an armistice has been signed with an enemy; it was for the Church to enquire into the merits and expediency of such a proposal. Moreover, it was not particularly welcomed on the Masonic side. Let us quote what Michel Dumesnil de Gramont, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of France, wrote in his book, *La Maçonnerie et l'Eglise Catholique* (pp. 9-12), bearing in mind that the Grand Lodge of France (Scottish Rite), the obedience to which Lantoine belonged.

is the spiritual branch of Freemasonry, according to modern progressives :

"An opponent of Masonry, in severe but courteous terms, wrote a few years ago that Catholic civilisation did not understand liberty in the same way as did Masonic civilisation, adding that 'as no reconciliation is possible between two such opposite principles, one or other of them will have to disappear.'

"Commenting on such a clear and forcible conclusion, the author of the booklet published in September 1934 under the auspices of the Grand Lodge of France, recognised that any reconciliation was in fact unthinkable.

"As far as Albert Lantoine is concerned, it would not be inappropriate to speak of his conversion.

"In fact, not so long ago, Albert Lantoine professed to be not only anti-clerical, but anti-Christian.

"Today, while still priding himself on the purity of his Masonic attitudes, Albert Lantoine no longer thinks it an honour to our Order that it should have been condemned by the Church. Catholicism now appeals to him as a protector of the noblest spiritual ideals, and even, as Antonio Coen thought, as the champion of freedom of thought.

"We are not clear how this new attitude can be reconciled with the accusations of perverted morals constantly brought against Christianity by the author of *Hiram couronne d'epines* (1926). No matter: Albert Lantoine is well within his rights in attempting this difficult compromise.

"But he goes further. Following the example of those repentant sinners who, towards the end of their days, return to devout habits and drag their entourage along with them, Lantoine would like French Masonry to accompany him in his pilgrimage towards Rome, and the watchword he offers our Order is a remark of Clavell's suggesting that Freemasonry is a complement to Christianity.

"His *Lettre au Souverain Pontife*, in which this theory is developed, is bound to cause a profound sensation in the bosom of the Grand Lodge of France.

"Many Masons of the Grand Lodge have been worried by Albert Lantoine's suggestions and have wondered whether those whose responsibility is to administer the Lodge have not perhaps been tempted to adopt them themselves.

"It is these anxieties which we have tried to answer. . . .

"We are told, and with truth, that there are prominent ecclesiastics who would agree with Lantoine's point of view and

be willing to implement such a truce as he suggests. We hesitate to cast doubts, but we know that other very different attitudes are to be heard within the Church.

"The Church, considering herself as entrusted with a divine mission, will never treat on equal terms with any earthly organisation and will always demand total submission.

"Perhaps Masonry would obtain the truce desired by Lantoine and his friends if it consented to address to the Holy See a letter similar to that through which Action Francaise was relieved of the interdict promulgated by the Congregation of the Index.

"We cannot think that there are many Masons in the Grand Lodge of France who would set their names to such a petition, and by so doing sign a spiritual death warrant for our Order."

The fearful conflict of 1939-45 interrupted all attempts to negotiate, but they were resumed more eagerly than ever as soon as the war was over.

The campaign which Father Gruber had secretly begun from the Catholic side was resumed in France, this time openly, by another Jesuit, Father Bertheloot. Between 1945 and 1948 the latter published a series of articles and books, all most carefully drawn up with a view to preparing for a rapprochement between the Church and Freemasonry. These books, moreover, were supported by serious documentation. Among others, he wrote:

Les Franc-Maçons devant l'histoire;

La Franc-Maçonnerie et l'Eglise Catholique—motifs de condamnation;

La Franc-Maçonnerie et l'Eglise Catholique—perspectives de pacification.

The campaign for closer relations between Freemasonry and the Church remained quiescent while Pius XII was Pope; obviously the flame was smouldering beneath the ashes, but the progressives, who by this time enjoyed considerable influence within the Church, realised that they had little chance of success during the Pope's lifetime.

With the accession of Pope John XXIII, and the growth of the new conceptions of ecumenism which followed this event, something like an explosion took place. A sudden flowering of works devoted to Freemasonry blossomed forth from a variety of authors. Historians, philosophers, journalists, politicians and lecturers, all worked, each in their own sphere, in favour of a reconciliation between the Catholic Church and Freemasonry. One received a distinct impression that this was the outcome of an international campaign.

carefully orchestrated, as it were, and whose nerve-centre lay in France.

The Second World War had wrought profound changes in life and created new conditions of existence throughout the entire world. Among these were:

(1) The existence, which was an unprecedented event in history, of a considerable body of progressive clergy at Rome, where they rapidly achieved widespread and growing influence;

(2) The election of a Pope—John XXIII—who was believed by the progressives to favour their cause;

(3) The increasingly formidable danger of Communism, which had by then become the second great power in the world, about equal to the United States, and the threat of the extension of its influence in Asia, Africa and South America;

(4) The simultaneous and progressive socialisation of the laws, institutions and economies of political regimes outside the Soviet Union;

(5) The renewal of a religious spirit, or at least of a vague religiosity, which affected even Freemasonry itself;

(6) The meeting of the Ecumenical Council, which was empowered to discuss such problems and to take decisions on them—a Council which was attended by a strong contingent of progressive bishops who were in open conflict with the Roman Curia, which they regarded as consisting of a body of hardened reactionaries.

Taking advantage of these new conditions, the campaign for closer relations with Freemasonry was taken up again with increased strength and with considerable material forces at its disposal. This time it was not a question of abstract discussion; the progressives had an immediate and precise objective in sight—to obtain from the Vatican a reappraisal of the Church's traditional attitude towards Freemasonry and the cancellation of the condemnations pronounced against it. There was, as we have said, a profusion of writers devoted to the task of defending Freemasonry and its interests. Let us mention here, among others:

Maurice Colinon : *L'Eglise en face de la Franc-Maçonnerie* (Ecclesia);

Roger Priouret: *La Franc-Maçonnerie sous les lys* (Grasset);

Serge Hutin : *Les Francs-Maçons* (Seuil);

Roger Peyrefitte: *Les Fils de la Lumière* (Flammarion);

Guy Vinatrel: *Communisme et Franc-Maçonnerie* (Presses continentales);

Yves Marsaudon: *L'Oecumenisme vu par un Franc-Maçon de tradition* (Vitiano);

J. Corneloup: *Universalisme et Franc-Maçonnerie* (Vitiano).

We should also mention the Hourdin press group, which produces a collection of Catholic progressive publications, newspapers and magazines, such as Informations Catholiques Internationales, Temoignage Chretien, and others.

Nevertheless, amid this avalanche of propagandists, three names emerge as especially important: Father Riquet, S.J.; the Catholic writer, Alec Mellor; and the Freemason, Marius Lepage, Worshipful Master of the Lodge at Volnay.

Father Riquet has attracted notice since the war as a result of his vigorous campaigns in favour of Jewish and Masonic circles. He has various direct contacts with these groups, and he gave a lecture at the Volnay de Laval Lodge at the invitation of its Worshipful Master, Marius Lepage, who is at the forefront of the campaign on the Masonic side.

The writer, Alec Mellor, a lawyer by profession, is the quasi-official mouthpiece for the progressive party in these matters. He works closely with Father Riquet and Brother Lepage. We do not in any way seek to belittle the worth or ability of these three persons, but we do dispute their evidence, their arguments and their conclusions.

Alec Mellor pleads his case in two important books, *Nos Freres Separes*, which has recently been published in England as *Our Separated Brethren*, and *La Franc-Maçonnerie a l'Heure du Choix*, published in 1961 and 1963 respectively.

These two books must be read by the modern student of the problem of Freemasonry for two most important reasons:

Firstly, because Mellor expounds in them in the most complete detail the progressive arguments in favour of Freemasonry;

And secondly, because they are published by Mame of Tours in France, an old and respected Catholic publishing house, and they carry the imprimatur of their diocese. As regards the imprimatur, it is true to say that, in the eyes of the Catholic Church, this only certifies that the book contains nothing contrary to Catholic doctrine in matters of faith or morals: it does not in any way signify or imply agreement on the part of the Church with the opinions expressed therein. Nevertheless, in the eyes of many unthinking members of the public, the imprimaturs on Mellor's books signify that they carry the official approval of the Catholic hierarchy, and that they have a peculiar importance for that reason.

We shall take these two books as the basis for our study of the relationship between the Church and Freemasonry, and in answering the case as presented by their author, we shall take our stand on Masonic documents whose authenticity is beyond question.

It would be hard to find anywhere in the world a problem more

complex and mysterious than Freemasonry; there is scarcely any question more hotly disputed or subject to such conflicting accounts; no other problem so resists lucid analysis. Yet it is a matter of vital importance, for it is closely linked with the whole great drama of subversion in the modern world.

Thus we shall endeavour to set out the essence of the problem, and let us begin by summarising briefly the spirit and purport of Mellor's arguments.

Mellor has nothing but haughty disdain for Catholics who warn their co-religionists against Freemasonry, and whom he describes as "integralists".

"By antimasonry is implied here a certain kind of intellectual clumsiness and laziness which tends systematically to explain everything, particularly the misfortunes of a country, in terms of Freemasonry. It is a fixation, an obsession, coupled with a pseudo-literary form of expression. Commercial considerations may enter into it, but much more often what is revealed is a mentality of fear, hatred and persecution. It is a psychosis. Freemasonry is merely its theme. It differs only in its complexion from other psychoses, two of which, at least, are well known in psychiatry: the anti-Jesuit and the anti-Semite.

"Antimasonry in this sense must be carefully distinguished:

(1) from motivated, reasoned disapproval—whether we consider it justified or not is another matter.

(2) from spiritual condemnations (exemplified by the pontifical bulls, but one might also quote some statements of Protestant views).

(A. Mellor: *Our Separated Brethren—the Freemasons*, 1964, p. 243)

"Medieval literature contains not a single line hostile to operative Masons. Their secrets were never suspect, which, as we have seen, is certainly the best proof that there was nothing to suspect.

"Once the Masonic secret had changed its character and taken on a new significance, antimasonry loomed up.

"The oldest antimasonic suspicions come three-quarters of a century before the first Pontifical condemnation, dating back to a period even before the foundation of Grand Lodge. They come before the rise of speculative Masonry, and are found as long ago as the period of transition. It might be said that the antimasonic spirit was on the watch, so to speak, waiting for the first affirmation of the famous secret. Its first two manifestations were of Protestant inspiration; the popes of the period doubtless knew nothing about the matter..." (A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 244)

In both camps are to be found those who will not be reconciled.

"On the Catholic side, they are represented by those who refuse to change their habits of thought and by the sort of intellectuals rightly or wrongly known as integralists.

"The latter are sometimes very competent theologians. In the depth of their being they no doubt feel an anxiety which will not let them rest. Any idea which is in the least degree new, in their eyes smacks of heresy, ironism, or syncretism. The hierarchy are traitors. The Pope himself is not immune from their criticisms.

"Moreover, this kind of man has a moral sense peculiar to himself, accompanied by spying on others and the most indelicate kind of investigation. To unearth the guilty, the integralist is not above nosing in dustbins, picking the locks of drawers, or using methods appropriate to professional spies in order to obtain photocopies of manuscripts, including rough drafts representing only the first stages in a man's thinking. Their minds are neither contemplative nor constructive, for, as a famous saying has it, there are doubtless no problems for them. All that interests them is to bar the way.

"Such are the irreconcilables. Many of them represent only themselves, that is to say, nothingness. . . ."

(A. Mellor: *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*, pp. 451-452)

Thus Mellor, as we see from the above, severely castigates Catholics who are not progressives.

When speaking of Masons or Jews, on the other hand, his heart overflows with brotherly love and Christian charity; the Freemasons are generous, broad-minded and enlightened men reacting with dignity and tolerance against the hateful attacks launched upon them by professional mud-slingers, known as integralists. His bias is so palpable and so extreme that it is enough to make one laugh or close the book. We would hasten to recognise, however, that most of the Masonic authors quoted by Mellor are much more cautious and objective than he is in judging their political or religious opponents. I myself have had the pleasure of interviews with highly-placed English and French Masons, such as Albert Lantoine, and the conversation never descended from the level of objective discussion to that of systematic abuse.

Reading Mellor's books leaves one with the impression that he is the mouthpiece of certain Masonic circles which are allied to progressive Catholics against anyone who stands for tradition, whether in religion or politics.

According to his own statements, Mellor is on terms of close

friendship with a large number of prominent Freemasons from whom, exclusive of any other source, he has received his documentary evidence. The list he gives us in his second book, *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*, is imposing:

"May I be permitted to express my thanks at this point to several Masons, in the order in which their respective obediences will be studied in this book.

"In English-speaking Freemasonry, J. W. Stubbs, Grand Secretary of the United Grand Lodge of England; A. R. Hewitt, Librarian and Curator of Grand Lodge; and my learned friend, Harry Carr, Secretary of that home of learning, the Lodge Quatuor Coronati No. 2076.

"In German Freemasonry, Theodore Vogel, former Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Germany; Richard Muller-Borner, the present Grand-Master; and Baron Ferdinand von Cles, former Grand Orator of the Grand Lodge.

"In Dutch Freemasonry, C. M. R. Davidson, former Grand Master of the Grand Orient of the Netherlands.

"In Scandinavian Freemasonry, A. Nyvang, Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge of Denmark, and Lee Davidsen, Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge of Norway.

"Ernest Van Hecke, Grand Master of the National Grand Lodge of France; A. L. Derosiere, Deputy Grand Master; Jean Baylot, former Prefet de Police and Grand Orator of the Grand Lodge, and several of their fraternity, especially Marius Lepage, who is linked to me by personal friendship.

"J. Corneloup of the 33rd Degree, former Grand Commander of the Grand College of Rites.

"G. Vinatrel and Leon Fobain, Worshipful Master of the old and respected Lodge 'La Bonne Foi' of St. Germain en Laye, of the Grand Orient of France, and also several others of the same fraternity.

"In the Scottish Rite, Charles Riandey, Sovereign Grand Commander of the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite; Professor Stanislas Bonnet of the 33rd Degree; Sir Donald Makgill, Grand Secretary General of the Supreme Council of the Royal Arch of England, and Major J. D. Reed of the 33rd Degree; the Grand Master, Richard Dupuy, and G. Chadirat and G. Hazan, former Grand Masters of the Grand Lodge of France; Alexis Zousmann, President of the Condorcet-Brossolette Circle; my old and well-beloved friend and fellow-student, Roger Normand, Worshipful Master of the Lodge of the Scottish Hospitaliers; and L. Portoukalian, Head of the Secretariat of the Grand Lodge of France.

"Giordano Gamberini, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Italy.

"Without mentioning all those who, because of the foolishness of their fellow-men, have received my promise not to reveal their names."

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, pp. 10-11)

It will be noticed that the above list of acknowledgements says nothing of the notorious cleavage between "regular" and "irregular" Masons—between the rationalist, agnostic and revolutionary Grand Orient, on the one hand, and the spiritualist and non-political Grand Lodge, on the other.

Mellor's evidence is one-sided and comes exclusively from Masonic sources. He quite simply ignores both non-Masonic authors and those Masonic writers whose opinions do not agree with his own.

And yet, since the eighteenth century, there has been a long line of anti-Masonic writers of various nationalities, of whom France has produced more than any other country. Many of them are thoroughly reputable historians and thinkers, who have furnished a considerable body of evidence and whose labours cannot be brushed aside or ignored if one wishes to make a serious study of the question. Yet, with a few extremely rare exceptions, scarcely one of them is mentioned in Mellor's books, as if they had never existed and never written a line on the subject. It would be impossible to give a complete list of them here, and we shall only mention a few of the well-known names among many others.

In France, there are the works of the Abbe Barruel, Gustave Bord, Augustin Cochin, and Bernard Fay, who all specialised in the French Revolution of 1789; Gougenot des Mousseaux, Cretineau-Joly, the Abbe E. Barbier, N. Deschamps, and Claudio Jannet, who wrote in the second half of the nineteenth century; and Monseigneur Delassus and Monseigneur Jouin who made a special study of the part played by Freemasonry in the struggle against religion and in the campaign of world-wide subversion.

Monseigneur Jouin, parish priest of St. Augustin in Paris, deserves special mention here, for he created and directed up to his death a few years before the Second World War, a centre of international studies devoted to Freemasonry, Judaism and revolutionary subversion in the world, and edited a regular magazine, *Revue Internationale des Societes Secretes*. It was probably the only organisation of this kind to have existed in the world, and Monseigneur Jouin was personally commended for his courageous work in exposing the sectarian enemies of religion by Pope Benedict XV in 1919. Monseigneur Jouin was naturally the pet aversion of liberal and subversive elements. The only accusation which can be brought against

him is that he was a man of great kindness; sometimes he was a little too kind in welcoming collaborators who were below the standards required for his magazine. Mellor speaks of the *Revue Internationale* with contemptuous and amused condescension. But not all Freemasons would agree with him. Serge Hutin, for example, says in his book *Les Franc-Maçons*, "The collection (the R.I.S.S.) is moreover extremely useful to the historian, for it contains evidence unobtainable elsewhere on the rituals and activities of the lodges, especially of those given over to esoteric and occult sciences. Very cleverly, the editors always start from authentic sources; it is their interpretation which is oriented."

Other French writers include Copin-Albancelli and J. Marques-Riviere, both former Masons, who have given invaluable testimony on the life and activity inside the lodges; Charles Maurras, A. G. Michel, Henri Coston and R. Valery-Radot, who have concentrated on Freemasonry's political role in France and throughout the world; and P. Loyer and F. Colmet Daage, who were both remarkable lecturers on Freemasonry; not to mention many others.

In England there are the works of Professor Robison, a contemporary of the Abbe Barruel; Nesta Webster, a modern historian of revolutionary subversion, and the only woman to have acquired an international reputation in this sphere; Mgr. Dillon and Walton Hannah; and the Rev. Penney Hunt, a Nonconformist Minister whose studies and revelations ended in an official ban on Freemasonry within the Methodist Church.

In Germany there are Eckert, Dr. Wichtl, and the Baron von Stotzingen.

In Ireland there are Father Cahill, S.J., and Father Denis Fahey, both authors of great importance, who have devoted several large volumes to the study of Freemasonry and world subversion.

In Spain there are the Abbe Tusquets, J. Boor and Mauricio Carl, who devoted himself to a study of subversion throughout the world.

In Poland there is Count Malynski, who published over thirty volumes on this subject alone.

In Italy, there are Senator L. Federzoni and Father Caprile, S.J. The latter writes in the review, *Civiltà Cattolica*, and is a theologian who has devoted himself to the study of Freemasonry in Italy for years, but since the nomination of Father Arrupe as Superior-General of the Jesuits, and as a result of the new attitude produced by the Vatican Council, the Jesuit review, *Civiltà Cattolica*, no longer publishes articles on Freemasonry, and Father Caprile has been ordered to cease all activity in this sphere. In Rumania there is Professor A. C. Cuza.

In the United States there are Arthur Preuss, Father H. Thurston and Father Michael Kenny.

There is no question, therefore, that Mellor's evidence is one-sided, since it supports only the point of view of Masonic authors or their progressive allies. However, we are now going to reply to his arguments chapter by chapter, since, as far as we are aware, apart from a few brief articles in specialist reviews, this has not yet been undertaken by anyone.

THE PONTIFICAL CONDEMNATIONS

MELLOR attributes the greatest importance to the pontifical condemnations of Freemasonry, and on this point we can entirely agree with him.

The essential fact which stands out in the whole history of Freemasonry, he says, is its condemnation by the Church. Elsewhere he speaks of the immense event that was the first condemnation by Clement XII in 1738, a condemnation many times renewed afterwards.

"The prophetic date of 1738 marks the beginning of the conflict in which Freemasonry and the Church were thereafter on opposite sides—surely one of the greatest and gravest conflicts in human history. It was also clear that from that moment Masonry began to subdivide, progressively losing its purely English character. The local Grand Lodges became more and more independent, an ingratitude of which the mother Grand Lodge of England was to complain from time to time."

(A. Mellor: *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*, p. 48)

These condemnations entail unavoidable excommunication, an embarrassing point for a Catholic writer who fervently proclaims his faith and his respect for hierarchical authority. That, however, is no obstacle to Mellor:

"But has not a terrible word just slipped from the pen? Exclusion! And what about the excommunicated?"

"Respect for the Tower of the Keys' dictates this question to our consciences, certainly; there is one simple answer, however: they too are our brothers."

"Then let us open our arms to them like brothers."

(A. Mellor. *Our Separated Brethren*, p. 15)

The crucial question before us is whether the papal condemnations are final, for if they are, the whole campaign being conducted today

for their annulment by liberal-minded priests and laymen is absolutely without foundation.

Clement XII and Leo XIII proclaim that they are final.

With certain oratorical precautions, Mellor and others claim that they are not.

Clement XII ended his famous bull in 1738 with the following solemn condemnation:

"Therefore, bearing in mind the great harm which is often caused by such societies or conventicles not only to the peace of the temporal state but also to the well-being of souls, and realizing that they are thus in discord with both civil and canonical sanctions. . . .

". . . in fact, to prevent the hearts of the simple being perverted, and the innocent secretly wounded by their arrows, and to block that broad road which could be opened to the uncorrected commission of sin, and for other just and reasonable motives known to Us; We therefore, having taken counsel of some of Our Venerable Brothers among the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, and also of Our own accord and with certain knowledge and mature deliberation, with the plenitude of the Apostolic power do hereby determine and have decreed that these same societies, companies, assemblies, meetings, congregations or conventicles of Liberi Muratori or Francs Massons, or whatever name they may go by, are to be condemned and prohibited, and by Our present Constitution, valid for ever, We do condemn and prohibit them."

(Clement XII: In Eminenti, quoted in A. Mellor:
Our Separated Brethren, pp. 159-160)

In his great Encyclical, *Humanum Genus*, Leo XIII is equally formal and explicit.

"Since we are aware that our best and firmest hope of remedy lies in the strength of that divine religion which the Freemasons hate in proportion to their fear of it, we hold it therefore to be of supreme importance to utilize all its wonderful salutary power against the common enemy. Accordingly, whatever Our Predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, have decreed in view of opposing the designs and machinations of Freemasonry, whatever they have enacted to keep men from becoming affiliated to such associations or to withdraw from them, if they had had the misfortune to be already members, all and each of these measures we ratify and confirm by our Apostolic Authority. Full of confidence in the goodwill of Christians, we beg and beseech each one of them, for the sake of his eternal salvation, to consider it a sacred obligation

of conscience never in the least to deviate from what the Apostolic See has enjoined in this matter.

"First of all, tear away the mask from Freemasonry and let it be seen as it really is. . . ." (pp. 19-20)

What is Mellor's answer to this ?

"Since certain Catholics—without reprimand from the hierarchy — and certain Masons have closed some of the gap between them, one question inevitably arises: will they eventually close it completely? It is the logical corollary of these new tendencies.

"So why avoid it?

"It is, for all that, a very serious question, and it is therefore important to set the problem out with the utmost clarity, without deceit or ambiguity:

"Is the condemnation of Freemasonry, first by Clement XII in 1738 and some fifteen times more thereafter, irrevocable?

"If not, then on what bases could there be reconciliation?

"That is the final problem.

"Canon 1,399 prohibits Masonic books outright.

"These arrangements were the subject of a reminder from the Holy Office on 20th April, 1949, in response to a letter from the Bishop of Trent; and on 19th March, 1950, in the *Osservatore Romano*, Father Cordovani, Master of the Sacred Palaces, again stressed that they were still in force.

(A. Mellor: *Our Separated Brethren*, p. 287)

"They are the juridicial translation of the encyclicals, none of which has fallen into abeyance, including the first, of Clement XII.

"But what one Pope has done, could not another undo? It is necessary here to distinguish most carefully between questions of dogma or morality on the one hand, and factual situations capable of changing on the other hand. The latter come under juridicial rule, which, by definition, can be altered. What are we to understand by Clement XII's proclamation that his bull is *perpetuo valitura*, valid in perpetuity? These two words call for an explanation. They signify that the bull is not a temporary law, limited to the duration of his reign; they could not imply that Freemasonry will never change. That would be ascribing an unduly prophetic sense to them. We must deduce:

"(a) that the Freemasonry which Clement XII wished to condemn is that of 1738, in so far as it is perpetuated, and

"(b) that he did not mean to commit his successors until the end of time, even if modifications of fact changed the whole nature of the problem. And that could not be ruled out.

"These modifications have not yet appeared; indeed, Freemasonry as Leo XIII condemned it proved considerably more deserving of condemnation than any which Clement XII had known. Yet, if the historical facts had been different, these modifications might have taken place.

"Henceforth we can see in what sense condemnation of Freemasonry is irrevocable, which is sufficient for us to understand in what sense it is not irrevocable.

"What will be decided if the Freemasonry of the future should develop in the opposite direction to that which it has taken in the past?

"Quite clearly it is only on this supreme condition that the final step could be taken.

"The theoretical solution is obvious. It is not because of its name that Freemasonry has been condemned, and if in the future a quite different society existed under the same name it is conceivable that it would no longer merit condemnation—at least, not for the same reasons. The old condemnations would not, for all that, be withdrawn. The Pope would simply check that they no longer affected the institution which had preserved the name of Freemasonry, or which had assumed it... (A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 288)

"Let us not avoid realities: for the majority of 'Latin' Masons today reconciliation with the Church would not even be desirable. 'Attitudes have hardened', would be the reply from many of them, some through open hostility, others through pessimism.

"But it is the Masonic elite whom we have in mind, those free thinkers in the undistorted sense of the term, those decent men who regard reconciliation as highly desirable, not for the Church to which they do not claim allegiance, but for Masonry, whose deeply sincere members they are.

"It is with spirits such as these, akin to our own, that the dialogue can be started.
(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 292)

"If one ignores certain individual excesses (and even some collective excesses which came to nought), Masonry as such has never declared open war on the Church. Its statements of principle are far less denials of dogma than the mutilated 'credos' of confessions separated from Rome. So there is no reason to place it in the first category (as censured by the Church as a declared Enemy).
(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 293)

"There is no need to trace the history of all the breaking up which, for some years, has made cracks everywhere in the Masonic

structure, the most considerable of which was the break between the Grand Lodge of France and the Grand Orient. One certainty alone concerns us: the institution is still evolving. The old forms are worn out. A new spirit is appearing which tends to break with habits of thought proper to the end of the nineteenth century. The time seems ripe to make a clean sweep of everything which has managed to harm the Masonic ideal. A kind of young Freemasonry is feeling its way. This explosion of generosity will not be short-lived; it deserves to be followed with the most sympathetic attention...

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 297)

"This might be the main outline of a general reconciliation, only sketched in, and not forgetting the extreme prudence which, from the practical angle, must accompany any attempt to put views of this kind into effect. Most Catholics and Freemasons alike will consider it Utopian. Some—less lazy—will think that difficulty is not synonymous with impossibility. Some Catholics, it is to be hoped, will even go so far as to admit that in the modern world the Christian's place is everywhere, that it is his absence which creates anti-Christian hostility, and that our separated brethren will return if we hold out our hand to them.

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, pp. 299-300)

"Contrary to the fable, according to which Freemasonry is a monolithic structure, there is not and probably never will be a more disjointed institution. . . .

"In this era of ecumenism, with the trend towards universal concepts, this force seems to be too deeply rooted in our civilisation to fail to be recognised, and consequently neither the Communist world nor the Church can ignore it. The former, as we have said, is a monstrous transposition of scholastic metaphysics into the political sphere.

"It is no longer a question of discovering whether Freemasonry has or has not been condemned, but of discovering whether any identity exists between Freemasonry as it was when it was condemned and the Freemasonry of today or tomorrow. What was not condemned was the name 'Freemasonry'.

"For the Catholic, this problem presents no obstacle. His conclusion will be, if he has any historical sense, that a 'dialogue' should be held between the Church and the Order...."

(A. Mellor: *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du choix*, p. 478)

As one can see, Mellor works up to the point very laboriously, but it is when at last he does openly confront the problem that the juggling commences. For indeed he has to show that the Vatican has

been wrong for nearly two hundred and fifty years, in that it has falsely condemned Freemasonry, and this he has to do without rising up against the Vatican's authority, and without setting it in opposition to himself. An exercise in walking a veritable intellectual tightrope.

This is how Mellor proceeds.

All the papal condemnations are reduced to the first, Clement XII's in 1738, and this in turn is reduced to the sole motive—the Masonic secret.

"The bull of Clement XII", he says, was a "doctrinal document of far-reaching effect, containing the seeds of all other condemnations of Freemasonry."

(A. Mellor: *Our Separated Brethren*, p. 165)

Indeed, Clement XII's condemnation is almost the only one with which he is concerned in his two books, as if the subsequent history of secular strife between the Church and Freemasonry can be traced solely to the Bull of 1738.

Yet, according to Mellor, the motives for the condemnation are not clearly described in Clement's bull. In other words, they are inconsistent, and cannot be taken seriously.

"On the Masonic question many tons of printed paper have been published. August Wolfstieg's *Bibliographie der freimaurerischen Literatur* comprises more than 50,000 titles alone. For all that we are still waiting for the answer to one question, the one from which everything issues: why was Freemasonry condemned by the Church in the first place?

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 15)

"Paradoxical, mysterious, inexplicable in a word (barring a secret motive); so the bull of Clement XII still seems."

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 84)

However Mellor recognises—for his books are full of contradictions — that Clement XII was an excessively tolerant pope and that the condemnation was the fruit of long study in consultation with the Cardinals.

"There were no popes more gentle, more accommodating, so to speak, than Clement XII and Benedict XIV. We shall see that the latter, through love of peace, took benevolence to the point of sending a projected encyclical to the French Minister before publishing it officially. They were men of the eighteenth century, as far removed as possible from the theocrats of the Middle Ages and even from certain modern Popes. It is probable that, faced

with the same problem, a Pope like Pius XI would have reacted much more energetically, and one can imagine what would have been the reactions of an Innocent IV or a Boniface VIII.

"The same observation can be made for those Cardinals, more patrons of the arts than theologians, who were involved in the condemnation: Corsini, Ottoboni, Zondedari, Giorgio Spinola. It is sufficient to look at their portraits to feel carried away into a different world of easy religion, sacred art, Italian diplomacy. They seem to be smiling still.

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 150)

"The spirit reigning in Papal Rome in the eighteenth century was at the opposite pole from the Inquisitorial spirit, and it took all the provocation which the affirmation of the Masonic secret seemed to possess to awaken in such tolerant Churchmen a spiritual anxiety which would far sooner lie dormant. If Freemasonry, stepping out of Time, had been able to choose its judges from the long history of the Church, it could never have found any more open to indulgence, and even laxity.

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 151)

"These then are the characters: highly placed prelates of their time, with all the non-ecclesiastical quality, in the modern sense, which that could imply; and there is no hiding the fact. These men belong to history just as they are. None of them appears as a theologian. Clement XII himself has left no reputation as a scholar. They were Italian lords, sumptuous, benevolent, lax—lax in their religious vigilance—and it is precisely these aspects which prevent their belonging to the race of Inquisitors....

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 154)

"The only common denominator for all the Masonic tendencies was the secret, but in requiring secrecy Freemasonry was not denying any dogma, was not even emitting a single thought. There was, even so, a hint there, a presumption of heresy, to which was added a second one: the large number of heretics—namely Protestants—who belonged to the society. Without being theologically heretical, it was therefore, vehemently suspected of heresy none the less, which in canonical terms permitted excommunication...

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 155)

"Consequently there need be no surprise if the gestation of the bull took nearly a year. Never was the famous saying better confirmed, that the Church is never pressed since Eternity is on her side....

"A text finally emerged. How many times was it re-read to the Pope and redrafted, in view of its inevitable vagueness? ...

"Probably when Clement XII, that old man at death's door, a living ruin of a man, put his signature at the bottom of the document which his eyes could not see but which was destined to have repercussions down through the centuries, it was yet he alone, perhaps, who appreciated the importance of that moment, who understood the reasons for the act to which his signature gave birth."

(A. Mellor: *Our Separated Brethren*, p. 156)

What is one to make of all this? The condemnation of 1738 was not the result of a decision which had been taken lightly, far from it. Powerful motives, then, must have impelled it. What are they? And what has the bull itself to say in this connection?

One must remember that it was hardly customary at that time to justify pontifical decisions in detail. Popes were regarded as serious men who knew what they were talking about and who did not lightly take such grave decisions, in a word, men whom one could trust in matters which concerned the affairs of the Church.

The bull expressly mentions the secrecy with which Freemasonry surrounds itself as a reason for its condemnation, and then adds:

"Bearing in mind the great harm which is often caused by such societies or conventicles not only to the peace of the temporal state but also to the well-being of souls, and realizing that they are thus in discord with both civil and canonical sanctions. . . .

". . . in fact, to prevent the hearts of the simple being perverted, and the innocent secretly wounded by their arrows, and to block that broad road which could be opened to the uncorrected commission of sin, and for other just and reasonable motives known to Us...."

Several ideas have been put forward to explain these secret motives mentioned by Clement XII. Mellor is absolutely certain that the motive was political, put forward in the guise of a religious issue. Thus the pope was supporting the Catholic monarchy of the Stuarts against the Protestant Hanoverians, who were defended and supported by English Freemasonry. And since the Jacobite struggle against the Hanoverians has long since lost all significance, Mellor proceeds to erase it with a stroke of his pen as a valid argument against Freemasonry.

This explanation is flat supposition, nothing more, and a risky supposition at that, destined to buttress the progressive thinkers' thesis, which aims at obtaining a revision of the papal condemnations, and yet it is announced with such assurance that it may impress the reader who is not fully versed in this complicated question.

To put it briefly, Mellor maintains that the only remaining valid motive for condemnation is that of secrecy, and then he launches into a muddled and interminable dissertation to prove that the secret is a false secret, and that at least it is a matter of past history which no longer has any meaning or value today.

At this stage of his reasoning, there is practically nothing left of the papal condemnations and the way is left free for a total revision of the policy which the Vatican has consistently upheld since 1738.

Further on in this work we devote a chapter to the study of the Masonic secret, but for the moment let us continue the history of the pontifical condemnations.

Clement XII's bull had very little practical effect on the governments of Europe, and none whatever on the French government.

"The Papacy was the only power which clearly recognised the peril which Freemasonry presented, and that almost from its beginning.

"The Papacy had definitely seen the peril, and had drawn attention to it in time.

"But her voice was not believed, and in France it was not even listened to. The parliaments refused to ratify the pontifical bulls, and since they were not promulgated they achieved no visible effect. A world was about to vanish."

(G. Bord: *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France des origines à 1815*, pp. 194-196)

Confronted with this indifference, Clement XII's successor, Benedict XIV, renewed the first condemnation on 18th May, 1751. And there again, as Mellor openly recognises, neither the pope nor the cardinals of his entourage were fanatical inquisitors.

"In the opinion of all his contemporaries, if ever a man was quite the opposite of a fanatic, of a persecutor, that man was Prospero Lambertini, elected Pope under the name of Benedict XIV upon the death of Clement XII. Nor was anyone more a man of the eighteenth century. He had its keen finesse, its elegance of speech and style, and even its irony. The 'graces' which Lord Chesterfield so commended to his son as being essential: tolerance, a wonderful knowledge of human nature, in addition to his generous patronage of the arts, and all crowned by his charity—this was the Pope, by far the greatest of his period."

(A. Mellor: *Our Separated Brethren*, p. 197)

After Benedict XIV, the condemnations were renewed by Pius VI, Pius VII (1821), Leo XII (1825), who described Freemasonry as "the

Church's capital enemy", Pius VIII (1829), Gregory XVI (1832 and 1839), and Pius IX (1846, 1864, 1865, 1873, 1876).

After Pius IX we come to the pontificate of Leo XIII, which marks an important date in the Church's struggle against Freemasonry. On 20th April, 1884, Leo XIII promulgated the celebrated encyclical *Humanum Genus*, which is entirely and exclusively devoted to the "Sect of the Freemasons". It is the most comprehensive and important document which the Vatican has ever published on this subject. In it Freemasonry is condemned with the utmost severity and without appeal, and yet, according even to his opponents, Leo XIII was an extremely liberal pope.

The following extracts will serve to give the reader a summary resume of the whole work.

It begins with a preamble in which the Pope recalls the eternal struggle between the Church of Christ and the powers of darkness.

"In our day, the partisans of evil seem to be drawing closer together and, as a body, appear to be animated with extraordinary energy, under the leadership and with the assistance of the widely diffused and strongly organized association known as Freemasonry.

"Our Predecessors, ever vigilant and solicitous for the safety of the Christian people, promptly detected the presence of this dangerous enemy and its designs, as soon as it came out of the darkness in which it had been secretly plotting. Looking far ahead into the future they raised the alarm and enjoined on both rulers and people to be on their guard and not to allow themselves to be ensnared by the tricks and devices prepared for their deception."

(*Humanum Genus*, tr. Rev. D. Fahey, p. 2)

The Encyclical then explains the motives for the condemnation of Freemasonry.

At the fore are the anti-Christian principles which constitute the essence of Freemasonry, and which may be described as "naturalism".

"Their ultimate aim is to uproot completely the whole religious and political order of the world, which has been brought into existence by Christianity, and to replace it by another in harmony with their way of thinking. This will mean that the foundation and the laws of the new structure of society will be drawn from pure Naturalism."

(*Humanum Genus*, *ibid.*, p. 7)

The Encyclical explains at length in the following paragraphs what this implies. The second motive for the condemnation of Freemasonry is the

political action which flows from the first. For Freemasonry strives to introduce its principles into the laws and institutions of States.

"In the sphere of politics, the Naturalists lay down that all men have the same rights and that all are equal and alike in every respect; that everyone is by nature free and independent; that no one has the right to exercise authority over another; that it is an act of violence to demand of men obedience to any authority not emanating from themselves. All power is, therefore, in the free people. Those who exercise authority do so either by the mandate or the permission of the people, so that, when the popular will changes, rulers of States may lawfully be deposed even against their will. The source of all rights and civic duties is held to reside either in the multitude or in the ruling power in the State, provided that it has been constituted according to the new principles. They hold also that the State should not acknowledge God and that, out of the various forms of religion, there is no reason why one should be preferred to another. According to them, all should be on the same level.

(Humanum Genus, *ibid.*, pp. 13-14)

The third motive is the secret methods used by Freemasonry in the political sphere. We do not propose to discuss this again here, but refer the reader to chapter 3, which deals with the whole question of Masonic secrecy.

The fourth motive for condemning Freemasonry is the breakdown in moral standards which accompanies the influence of Freemasonry in politics, and which indeed it sometimes uses deliberately as a weapon.

"Since in general no one obeys cunning and crafty schemers so readily as those whose courage and self-control have been sapped and broken by subjection to the yoke of their passions, there have been found in Freemasonry men who have proclaimed their determination to strive skilfully and cunningly to saturate the masses with every form of vice. They hope that the masses thus debased will be like putty in their hands to carry out their future projects, no matter what may be their nature."

(Humanum Genus, *ibid.*, p. 12)

The fifth motive is the danger which Freemasonry represents from the social point of view, for it prepares the way for Communism—a question to which we have devoted chapter 9 of this work.

Finally, the Encyclical ended by exhorting men to look to the Church as the central focus of resistance to Masonic subversion.

"Whatever our Predecessors have decreed in view of opposing the designs and machinations of Freemasonry ... all and each of these measures we ratify and confirm. Full of confidence in the goodwill of Christians we beg and beseech each one of them, for the sake of his eternal salvation to consider it a sacred obligation never in the least to deviate from what the Apostolic See has enjoined in this matter . . . and since it is becoming that we ourselves should indicate to you the most suitable line of conduct in the circumstances, we enjoin the following:

"First of all, tear away the mask from Freemasonry and let it be seen as it really is." (Humanum Genus, *ibid.*, pp. 19-20)

What do the Masons say about this Encyclical? And what do progressive thinkers, and notably Mellor, who is their spokesman—what do they say?

Let us first of all hear Dumesnil de Gramont, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of France, for the Masons.

"What a terrible text this Encyclical contains," he writes, "and one which our brothers ought to read frequently. Terrible and surprising too, when you consider that its author is still considered as the finest, the most clear-sighted and the most liberal of modern popes. One is overwhelmed at its vehement tone, the violent epithets, the audacity of the accusations, the perfidy of the appeals to secular repression. All the odious fables, all the absurd grievances which, not so long ago, were circulated in France by anti-masonic factions, are implicitly and even explicitly contained in this document which, we are sorry to say, seems rather to resemble the work of a pamphleteer than of a Pontiff."

(M. Dumesnil de Gramont: *La Maconnerie et l'Eglise Catholique*, p. 18)

And what does Mellor say?

While he writes at length on Clement XII's bull, to which he devotes part of his book, Mellor becomes very silent and reserved on the subject of *Humanum Genus*—in brief, he avoids discussing it, save for two and a half pages out of the eight hundred and thirty five which his two books comprise.

The fact is that *Humanum Genus* is a dire thorn in the flesh of progressive thinkers for, this time, the motives for the condemnation of Freemasonry are clearly and precisely formulated at length, and no amount of argumentation can escape that fact. Instead, progressive thinkers prefer to avoid discussing the question; they quite simply ignore the Encyclical.

It is perfectly obvious that Leo XIII was convinced of the extreme importance of the problem of Freemasonry, for he referred to it on several occasions after *Humanum Genus*, in 1890, 1892, 1894, and in 1902. He published a double letter in 1892, one to the Archbishops and Bishops and the other to the people of Italy, which was entirely concerned with the question of Freemasonry. In this letter he renewed and reinforced the themes he had elaborated in *Humanum Genus*.

The letter began:

"The spirit common to all former sects which have revolted against Catholic institutions has sprung up with fresh vigour in that sect which is called Masonic... .

"Whole cities are overrun by its contagion; civil institutions are becoming more and more deeply penetrated with its inspiration. . . .

and the Pope concluded:

"Let us remember that Christianity and Freemasonry are fundamentally irreconcilable, so much so that to adhere to the one is to cut oneself off from the other."

Finally, in a new Encyclical promulgated on 19th March, 1902, Leo XIII described Freemasonry as:

". . . the permanent personification of the Revolution. It constitutes a sort of society in reverse whose aim is to exercise an occult overlordship upon society as we know it, and whose sole *raison d'être* consists in waging war against God and His Church."

(Encyclical: On the 25th Year of Our Pontificate)

To this very day the Vatican has confirmed and renewed the condemnation of Freemasonry and thus, by implication, the reasoning upon which this position is based, without the slightest deviation from its original position.

In 1906 Pius X attacked the ungodly sects.

In 1937 Pius XI drew attention to the alliance between Communism and Freemasonry in his Encyclical, *Divini Redemptoris*.

In 1946 and in 1949 the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office published the following declaration in reply to a question from the Italian Archbishops:

"Scottish rite Masonry falls under the condemnation decreed by the Church against Masonry in general, and there is no

reason to grant any discrimination in favour of this category of Masons."
(1946)

and again,

"Since nothing has happened to cause any change in the decisions of the Holy See on this question, the provisions of Canon Law remain in full force for every kind of Masonry whatsoever."

(20th April, 1949)

On 5 th January, 1954, the Holy Office condemned a work drawn up by the Grand Master of the Johannine rite of Austrian Freemasonry, (B. Scheichelbauer: *Die Johannis Freimaurerei*, 1953) and on 17th January the *Osservatore Romano*, the official Vatican journal, published a long article concerned with this particular branch of Masonry, from which we reproduce the following passage:

"Surprise may have been caused in certain quarters by this serious step taken by the Church, after the statements which have so insistently been circulated almost everywhere in recent years concerning the conciliatory attitude of the Johannine lodge of Austrian Freemasonry towards the Catholic Church.

"The plea was advanced, in this connection, that the excommunication decreed against members of Masonic sects by Canon 2,335 of the Canon Law, did not affect those who belonged to the aforesaid lodge.

"If there were any need for fresh proofs to confirm that the concepts of even the Johannine rite of Austrian Freemasonry are a positive perversion of religious principles, the above mentioned publication provided the most recent and the most irrefutable demonstration of that fact.

"The author is himself Grand Master of the Austrian Johannine lodge.

"We shall confine ourselves here to a summary examination of the principle ideas expressed in the book.

"It is there asserted that 'the direct aim of Freemasonry is to bring its own members to the "Gnosis"', as being the only possible method of attaining the Divine Essence, and to overcome the existing contradiction between faith and science. Thus 'Gnosis' is nothing less than Anthroposophy, though this term is not expressly employed. Its principle dogma is Pantheism. Herein resides the 'Ars Regia', or sovereign skill, through which man acquires the knowledge of the identity of his own being with the divine being.

"It goes on to declare that Freemasonry favours tolerance in matters of dogma, seeing that no religious society, not even the

Catholic Church, is in possession of the whole truth. Although there are to be found in all religions traces of natural religious knowledge, yet the 'Gnosis' is the only true science; other systems of knowledge represent only a preparation for the true science, that is to say, the 'Gnosis'.

"No one can fail to see the gravity of such ideas and concepts, and how radically and fundamentally they are not merely at variance with revealed religion but utterly opposed to it.

"Moreover, the placing of this book on the Index is an effective warning to Catholics not to let themselves be deceived by those who are trying to persuade them into becoming attracted to Freemasonry by claiming that there is a change of attitude on its part towards the Catholic Church."

On 19th March, 1950, the Most Reverend Father Mario Cordovani, Master of the Sacred Palace, published an article on Freemasonry in the *Osservatore Romano*, which has special relevance to the present issue. The following are its most essential passages:

"One might reasonably suppose that after such a tragic lesson as the last war, we should all have become wiser and that our way of living would have been given a new direction. On the contrary, to our great surprise we have to take note of the fact that nothing, so to speak, has been learned from it, that the errors and methods of the past are still being repeated, bringing dangers which are greater and easier to foresee.

"Among the things which are springing up again with renewed vigour, and not only in Italy, is Freemasonry with its ever recurring hostility to religion and to the Church. One only needs to recall the speeches delivered in Parliament by the head of Italian Freemasonry.

"What appears to be a new feature in this Masonic renaissance is the rumour circulating in various social classes that a particular rite of Masonry might no longer be in opposition to the Church, whereby even Catholics can enrol at their ease in the sect without fear of excommunication and reproach. Those responsible for propagating these rumours must surely know that nothing has been modified in the Church's legislation relative to Freemasonry, and if they continue this campaign it can only be in order to profit from the naivety of simple folk.

"The Bishops know that Canon 684 and especially Canon 2,335, which excommunicates those who have given their names to Masonry without any distinction between rites, are as full in force today as they always have been; all Catholics ought to know this and remember it, so as not to fall into this snare, and also so as to

know how to pass due judgment on the fact that certain simpletons believe that they can call themselves both Catholics and Freemasons with impunity. This, I repeat, applies to all Masonic rites, even if some of them, in varying circumstances, declare that they are not hostile to the Church."

At this point it is worth interposing an illuminating passage from the paper *La Croix*, which on 6th February, 1964, made the following comment on Mellor's latest book, *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*:

"It would seem that raising the excommunication which continues to hang over the whole of Freemasonry scarcely ought to encounter insurmountable obstacles. Moreover, at the cost of some minor concessions on their part, Catholics ought to be allowed to be 'initiated'. Nevertheless, these prospects affect only regular Freemasonry. The case of irregular Freemasonry is different, and in particular that of the Grand Orient of France, which in 1877 inscribed atheism into its constitution. Before anything else could be done it would be necessary for the latter to return to regularity and to the true Masonic ideal, religious and non-political. Grand Orient Freemasonry and the whole of so-called 'Rites of the Latin Obedience' find themselves at the cross-roads. Overtaken by Communism in their secular ideas they no longer represent the 'future' and seem to be doomed to disappear."

The anonymous author of this commentary has probably never even read the Encyclicals. If he had, how could he have written this article?

It is merely for us to put the question, leaving the reader to form his own conclusions.

But, to return to the passage we are quoting from the *Osservatore Romano*, the Reverend Father Cordovani, Master of the Sacred Palace, goes on to say:

"Any agreement between the Church and Freemasonry, suggesting in this way that they were two powers giving juridical form to their new attitudes, would be a resounding instance of a flagrant contradiction. The man who does not share the views of the sect and who has truly Catholic feelings will appreciate the duty of ridding himself of these views, and of not adding another banner to the disloyal standards under which the fight goes on. . . .

"But does not this rigid attitude disregard the good will of some people who would like ecclesiastical authority to recognise some small sector of Freemasonry said not to be hostile to religion and to the Church? And is it not equally opposed to the spirit of

accommodation which the Church has shown in every epoch, outstripping everyone in a spirit of comprehension and generous charity?

"Only a frivolous-minded person could say that. . .

"This modern tendency, manifest among those who would gladly bring Catholicism into harmony with all ideologies and social movements, with every advance and about-turn—is not this a sign of heresy, even if among many it is unconsciously present? . . .

"It is to be hoped that these lines will clarify the position of the great number of people who have told us that they were in need of enlightenment.

"Let everyone re-read the pontifical documents, for they daily receive confirmation from Freemasonry's own words and deeds in various countries. . . ."

(Article by the Most Rev. Father Cordovani in the *Osservatore Romano*,
19th March, 1950)

Finally, on 20th February, 1959, the Plenary Assembly of the Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops of the Argentine, under the presidency of Cardinal Caggiano, published a long collective declaration on Freemasonry, from which we have taken the following passages:

"In the course of its plenary reunion, the Argentinian Hierarchy, confronted by various articles published in the Press by Freemasonry, felt obliged to make a public declaration to the faithful, following the recommendation of Leo XIII to 'first of all, tear away the mask from Freemasonry and let it be seen as it really is'. . .

"On 23rd May, 1958, in an address to the 7th week of Pastoral Adaptation, Pius XII mentioned that the roots of modern apostasy lay in scientific atheism, dialectical materialism, rationalism, illuminism, laicism, and Freemasonry—which was the mother of them all. . .

"In 1958, the IVth Interamerican Conference of Freemasonry, which was held in Santiago, Chile, declared that 'the Order helps all its members to obtain important posts in the public life of the nations'. After this came a dissertation on the theme of 'The Defence of Laicism', to be followed by directions as to the new tactics to be adopted by Freemasonry, which coincide with the latest instructions of the Communist International. Freemasons are to work for the triumph of laicism in all walks of life, and Communists are to subvert social order in order to create a favourable terrain in which to achieve their ends. This is how the instruction is worded: 'Intensify the campaign of laicisation through the

intermediary influence of the different political parties. Try and appease the alarm of the Catholic Church at Freemasonry by avoiding direct Masonic action. Intensify the action which will unsettle the unity of the working-class movements, so that they may the more easily be stifled afterwards. Freemasonry and Communism for the moment are pursuing the same objective in Latin America, which is why they must try and work together in the best possible way, without allowing the slightest sign of their alliance to become public. . . .'

"Proof that this is no dream is the Second International Congress for Universal Fraternity.

"World Freemasonry and Communism are preparing for a Congress which will be held at Montevideo, called 'The Second International Congress for Universal Fraternity'. It is a Masonic Congress of Communist inspiration which aims to subordinate the Masonic ideal of 'universal fraternity' to the expansion of the Soviet Communist International. The congress will take place in Holy Week, from 26th to 28th March, and its object is to prepare for the 'struggle for human confraternity and world peace'—two themes behind which Freemasonry and Communism disguise their evil intentions. . . .

"Marxism and Freemasonry both serve the common ideal of earthly happiness. ... A Freemason can accept completely the philosophical conceptions of Marxism. No conflict is possible between the philosophical conceptions of Marxism and Freemasonry', asserts the Grand Master of Freemasonry in Paris.

"To achieve its ends, Freemasonry uses high finance, high politics and the world Press; Marxism, on the other hand, uses social and economic revolution against the country, the family, property, morality and religion.

"Freemasons achieve their ends by secretly subversive means, Communists by openly subversive movements. Freemasonry activates sectarian political minorities; Communism relies on mass political movements exploiting their aspirations to social justice...

"Every Argentinian, and especially the young, should know that Catholicism and Freemasonry are completely contradictory and self-exclusive, like Christ and Antichrist. Also they ought to know that Liberalism or laicism, under whatever form it may take, is the very embodiment of Masonic ideology. . . .

"The Church of Christ presides over every level of the life of our country. It is present, vigilant and active in every important event in our history. Catholicism is the origin, the root and the essence of the people of Argentine. In other words, to make an attempt on Catholicism is to conspire against one's native country.

"We draw the attention of all who love their country to the two enemies of our traditions and our future greatness, Freemasonry and Communism, which are seeking the destruction of everything that is noble and sacred in our land.

"Given at the Villa San Ignacio, on 20th February in the Year of Our Saviour 1959, and signed by Cardinal Caggiano, president of the Plenary Assembly of the Argentinian Hierarchy, and by the Argentinian Archbishops and Bishops present at the reunion."

The advocates of an agreement between the Church and Freemasonry tell us that it is high time to revise and annul the Vatican's condemnations of Freemasonry, and in support of this contention they advance three reasons:

(1) The condemnations were a mistake and cannot be founded upon solid grounds of justification. The Church would win respect by recognising her error.

(2) The Vatican has never been able to formulate clearly and concisely valid motives for the condemnation.

(3) Freemasonry is profoundly evolutionary, and from having been rationalist, agnostic and anti-Christian, it is becoming spiritual in its regular obediences. Therefore the hostility with which the Church and Freemasonry have opposed each other no longer has any meaning.

The first two arguments are valueless. From 1738 to 1954 the Vatican has clearly and concisely formulated its motives for condemnation, and from the point of view of Catholic doctrine these motives are perfectly valid. The Church is not unique in this position, for numerous Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, Moslem and atheist governments have banned Freemasonry as a secret society which is subversive of social order and incompatible with stable rulership.

The third argument can, on the other hand, at a pinch be considered valid. Everything advances in the world, and if Freemasonry really were to deny its former doctrinal and political attitudes, the former condemnations would no longer correspond to this new situation. But a very long experience has taught us that Masonry is essentially infinitely variable in its exterior manifestations according to the political opportunity of the moment. Thus we must be extremely cautious in the face of these apparent transformations, and we are justified in requiring more than the simple assertions of Mellor or the Rev. Fr. Riquet to convince us that they are real.

Only the Church can decide on the attitude it should adopt in this field, and up to the present day the Vatican has clearly indicated that there is no real justification for the modification of its condemnations.

THE MASONIC SECRET

SECRECY is an essential part of Masonry and Mellor recognises it as being of capital importance. Here is a brief summary of his argument.

The secrecy which Freemasonry imposes on its initiates, and which surrounds all its activities, creates an atmosphere of mystery, uneasiness and suspicion, which poisons Masonry's relations with the outside world.

It was this secrecy, to the exclusion of every other known motive, which was the basis of Clement XII's well-known condemnation of 1738, and it is this secrecy which has caused Freemasonry to be distrusted, condemned or forbidden by numerous Catholic, Protestant, Moslem and other governments throughout the world.

Now, in the days of medieval operative Masonry there was a reason for this secrecy; it existed to protect the art of those who built the cathedrals. From the moment that Masonry became speculative and transformed itself into a "societe de pensee", there was no longer any reason for such secrecy.

However, apparently in the face of all logic, Freemasonry continues to impose an obligation of secrecy on its members.

Today, Freemasonry finds itself at the crossroads. If it wishes to put an end to the war between itself and Catholicism, which has raged since 1738, it must abandon this outdated notion of secrecy, for there is now no longer any justification for not discussing things frankly in broad daylight.

Mellor's argument is logical enough and would be valid if Masonry were really what he represents it to be: that is, simply a philosophical, religious, non-political society, as the Grand Lodge of England, or regular Freemasonry, as it calls itself, claims to be.

Mellor and others depict Freemasonry in colours which appease and soothe us, lulling any suspicions we may have had. But the texts from which we shall quote reveal a picture of Free-

masonry which offers us far less reassurance as to its aims and methods, its international organisation, its secrecy and its activity in international politics.

Let us then carefully examine the problem of Masonic secrecy. It is more difficult than most, for it is complex, confused and ambiguous, like everything else connected with Masonry.

Mellor asserts that secrecy is an outdated notion, that there is no longer any reason for it, and that in reality there is no secret.

The Encyclicals say exactly the opposite. In his bull of 1751 against the Freemasons, Pope Benedict XIV enumerates the motives for condemnation and justifies them. The basic motive is still the impenetrable secrecy with which Freemasonry seeks to surround itself, a result of the Masonic oath, "as if anyone had the right to take a promise or an oath to dispense him from replying to the legitimate authority seeking to find out whether, in such secret assemblies, there was nothing enacted against the State, religion and the laws."

In the Encyclical *Humanum Genus*, which was written in 1884, Pope Leo XIII deals at length with Masonic secrecy.

"The manifold differences among the members in regard to rights, duties and functions, the elaborate hierarchical distinction of orders and degrees, and the severe discipline by which the associates are governed, all these contribute enormously to the maintenance of secrecy. Candidates for admission to the society are obliged to promise and in most cases even to take a solemn oath that they will never, at any time or in any way, make known to anyone, either the members, or the signs or the doctrines of the society. In this way, by the help of a deceitful external appearance and by a steady cultivation of a policy of dissimulation, the Freemasons, like the Manicheans in former times, leave no stone unturned to keep themselves hidden and to have as witnesses of their actions only their associates."
(*ibid*, p. 5)

As it is, the leaders of Masonry have always regarded secrecy as an essential condition of the Order's existence and of its success. We will now quote from some Masonic texts which leave no doubt of this fact.

"Masonry should be felt everywhere, but nowhere should it be unveiled."
(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, p. 362)

"The whole strength of Masonry lies in its discretion. Our enemies fear us all the more because we never reveal our methods of action."
(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1929, pp. 81-82)

At the 1929 Convent of the Grand Orient, the Freemason Uhry, Deputy for the Oise, opened his report with these words:

"Some of our brethren would like Masonry to open itself up more to public view. I beg them to hold fast to this fact: that our Order can only keep its strength and effectiveness if it maintains its character of secrecy. On the day that we lose our peculiar character, based on discretion and secrecy, our effective action in the country will come to an end."

While we are discussing such a serious subject, we propose to quote from a secret Masonic document, which is extremely revealing of the international power of Freemasonry.

After the collapse of Bolshevism, the Hungarian government dissolved the lodges and published their archives. In their distress the Hungarian Masons called upon their brethren throughout the world, and it was then that the Masonic newspaper, *Latomia* of Leipzig, published the following interesting article:

"After the catastrophe the Freemasons, who had sent another address of welcome to the Emperor, Franz-Joseph, during the war, fervently embraced the socialist republican ideology out of the noble conviction that the time had come when the Masonic ideal would be accomplished. In their writings they made active propaganda in its favour and most of the leaders were Freemasons. . . .

(The movement then rapidly degenerated into Bolshevism and when it collapsed Freemasonry was dissolved.)

"In their distress, our Hungarian brothers turned to the North American Grand Lodges. The result was that, as Hungary was then negotiating a loan in America, the reply came back that this loan could not be considered until lawful institutions were re-established in Hungary—a clear allusion to the prohibition of Freemasonry.

"Thereupon the Hungarian government was obliged to open negotiations with the ex-Grand Master. The free resumption of Masonic work was proposed to him, on condition that non-Masons should have right of access to the sessions. This was naturally refused by the Grand Master and the loan miscarried."

(*Latomia* of Leipzig, No. 2/3, 1922, p. 31)

From this brief extract we may draw, among others, the following vitally important conclusions:

(1) On its own admission, Freemasonry played a leading role in

the Hungarian Socialist Revolution, which very quickly ended in the horrors of Bolshevism.

(2) American Freemasonry came to the help of Hungarian Freemasonry when the latter was forbidden by law in Hungary. This proves that an international liaison exists among the various Masonic bodies throughout the world; it also shows that any differences separating Continental Masonry from that in the English-speaking countries are ignored whenever the vital interests of the brotherhood are affected.

(3) International Freemasonry intervenes in the internal politics of certain countries and enjoys sufficient power to cause international loans to fall through.

(4) Freemasonry regards secrecy as such a necessary condition of its power and activity, that it prefers to be officially dissolved rather than allow a government the right to investigate its internal affairs.

Now remember that this information is furnished by a Masonic publication and is therefore indisputable. Why is secrecy so vital to Freemasonry ?

"Freemasonry claims to have an aim which is progressive, philanthropic and humanitarian. It seeks to guide the moral and spiritual development of humanity outside and above any differences of class, nationality or creed.

"Freemasonry, as described by its statutes, is an institution essentially progressive, philanthropic and humanitarian. Its aims are the search for truth, the study of morality and the practice of solidarity. It works for human betterment both materially and morally, and for the social and intellectual perfecting of man.

"Its principles are mutual tolerance, respect for others and for oneself, and liberty of conscience.

"Since it regards all metaphysical notions as falling exclusively within the individual decision of its members, it avoids dogmatic assertions.

"Its motto is: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

"The duty of Freemasonry is to extend to all human beings those fraternal links which already unite Freemasons throughout the world.

"It recommends its adepts to propagate its ideas through their example.

"In all circumstances the Freemason has a duty to help, enlighten and protect his Brother, even at the peril of his own life, and to defend him against injustice." (Edouard E. Plantagenet: *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France*, p. 41)

All this appears most attractive and perfectly innocuous. But the search for truth, the study of morality and the practice of solidarity have no need whatever to surround themselves with a rigorously kept secret.

There must then be something else. In fact, these attractive sounding principles have been very cleverly drawn up in order to conceal profoundly subversive activities under a cover of pleasing vagueness.

Mellor and the progressives are up in arms against the idea of subversion.

"Those who insult the Order have always proclaimed that the real but concealed aim of Freemasonry was world subversion. Not only have they always maintained this idea, but some of them certainly consider that we ourselves are hand-in-glove with Freemasonry."

(A. Mellor: *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*, p. 392)

Among those who have "insulted" the order in this way must be included Pope Leo XIII, for this was precisely the conclusion he reached in his Encyclical *Humanum Genus*:

"Their ultimate aim (the Freemasons') is to uproot completely the whole religious and political order of the world, which has been brought into existence by Christianity, and to replace it by another in harmony with their way of thinking. This will mean that the foundation and the laws of the new structure of society will be drawn from pure Naturalism."
(*ibid.*, p. 7)

The Pope's statements are confirmed by many Masonic authors, for example, Brother Quartier La Tente, whose name is celebrated in Freemasonry, and who said:

"Freemasonry has undertaken a task and a mission. It is a question of nothing less than the reconstruction of society upon an entirely new basis."

(*Two Centuries of Freemasonry*, 1917)

Again, Pope Leo XIII said:

"Freemasonry is the permanent personification of the Revolution; it constitutes a sort of society in reverse whose aim is to exercise an occult overlordship upon society as we know it, and whose sole *raison d'être* consists in waging war against God and His Church."

(Encyclical *On the 25th Year of Our Pontificate*,
19th March, 1902)

In this work of subversion, Freemasonry undertakes three tasks which represent three successive steps towards the final objective.

The first step is the work inside the lodges. Freemasonry gradually steeps its initiates in Masonic principles and ideas. It is a more subtle equivalent of Communist brainwashing techniques. The brethren formed in this way comprise groups active outside the lodges.

Secondly is the work of propaganda in the outside world. Freemasonry has perfected a very effective technique of occult propaganda in the world at large, which consists in spreading and imposing Masonic ideals outside the lodges, without revealing the secret source from which these currents originate. As one of the speakers at the 1922 Convent of the Grand Orient expressed it, "Masonry should be felt everywhere, but nowhere should its face be unveiled". It consists in spreading belief in the natural, inevitable and irresistible evolution of human progress.

The third step towards the final objective is in the field of political activity. The ideological propaganda, as described above, runs parallel with the political conspiracy, whose object is to seize power and place Freemasons in positions of command. As far as possible, the public is not to know that they are Masons.

All this vast field of activity is protected by two secrets: the esoteric secret inside the Masonic lodges; and the secret political action outside the lodges.

Let us now pass on to study the nature of the esoteric secret. In the first stage, new members are attracted by Freemasonry's generous and humanitarian professions of faith, and also by promises of influence and concealed assistance.

Candidates are carefully chosen and thoroughly vetted long before they are even approached. When they are received into the lodge, they are made to take an oath of secrecy, which is renewed every time they advance to a higher degree. At this point commences the second stage in the candidate's formation; as soon as he has become a Mason, a process of doctrinal formation (or brainwashing) begins, which will continue all his life.

The statements of principle are cleverly worded in vague, generous, humanitarian terms which can be interpreted in many very different ways. Cautiously, and by easy stages, a neophyte learns that these terms have a hidden meaning, a higher meaning, which he will not understand until he has undergone further initiation. In this way, he learns, one by one, of a succession of hidden meanings, which he is told are an ascent towards the Light, and in which he gradually becomes steeped. This is the purpose of the succession of different degrees; if the Mason is receptive, he climbs upward in the Masonic hierarchy, and yet he never at any time knows exactly where he stands in it, nor how many higher degrees or persons control the

organisation. As in the secret Communist organisation, one is never very sure whether the titular degrees correspond to the real seat of power.

Freemasonry is therefore in a sense a succession of secret societies superimposed on one another, whose mode of operation has been slowly laid bare, at least in broad outline, by a series of patient investigators; nevertheless, it remains unknown to the public at large and, all in all, continues to be very effective.

To justify the above statements, here are a few Masonic texts emanating from highly-placed dignitaries in the Order, who themselves admit to being initiates at a high level.

"The Blue Degrees", wrote Albert Pike, "are but the outer court or portico of the Temple. Part of the symbols are displayed there to the Initiate, but he is intentionally misled by false interpretations. It is not intended that he shall understand them; but it is intended that he shall imagine he understands them. Their true explanation is reserved for the Adepts, the Princes of Masonry. The whole body of the Royal and Sacerdotal Art was hidden so carefully, centuries since, in the High Degrees, as that it is even yet impossible to solve many of the enigmas which they contain. It is well enough for the mass of those called Masons, to imagine that all is contained in the Blue Degrees; and whoso attempts to undeceive them will labour in vain, and without any true reward violate his obligations as an Adept. Masonry is the veritable Sphinx, buried to the head in the sands heaped round it by the ages."
(A. Pike: *Morals and Dogma*, p. 819)

The well-known English Mason, Wilmhurst, says the same thing:

"The method in question (of Freemasonry) is that of initiation; the usage and practice is that of allegory and symbol, which it is the Freemason's duty, if he wishes to understand his system, to labour to interpret and to put to personal interpretation. If he fails to do so, he still remains—and the system deliberately intends that he should—in the dark about the Order's real meaning and secrets, although formerly a member of it."

(W. L. Wilmhurst: *The Masonic Initiation*, 1957, pp. 4-5)

And further on he says:

"We profess to confer initiation, but few Masons know what real initiation involves; very few, one fears, would have the wish, the courage, or the willingness to make the necessary sacrifices to attain it if they did."
(W. L. Wilmhurst, *ibid.*, p. 17)

For his part, Brother Oswald Wirth, so praised by Mellor, tells us:

"When Freemasonry, or for that matter any other confraternity based on initiation, prides itself on its impenetrable veil of secrecy, it is not a case of the transferable but of the intelligible content of the mysteries. One can divulge only the dead letter, not the spirit, which of its own accord reveals itself to those who are privileged to understand.

"It is a serious matter to ask for Initiation, for one has to sign a pact. Agreed, there is no external, formal, visible signature; it cannot be compared with signing one's name in blood, for being purely moral and immaterial, it demands that the man's soul be truly committed in the act. It is not, then, like driving a bargain with the Devil, in which the Evil One allows himself to be tricked; it is an agreement entered into seriously on both sides, and there is no escape from its clauses. The Initiates in fact contract into certain duties towards the pupil thus admitted to their school, yet the pupil himself is by that very fact indissolubly bound to his masters. . . .

"Note that the guides are never seen and do not thrust themselves forward. . . .

"At the basis of any real initiation there are certain duties contracted. Beware then of knocking at the door of the Temple if you are not resolved to become a new man. ...

"It would all be nothing more than a snare and a delusion, if you could ask to be initiated free of all obligation, without paying with your very soul for your entry into brotherly communion with the builders of this great humanitarian edifice, whose design has been traced by the Great Architect of the Universe. . . ."

(O. Wirth: *L'Ideal Initiative*, pp. 10-11)

Thus, there is a secret theology in Freemasonry, to use the trenchant expression of Rabbi Benamozegh, in his book *Israel et l'Humanite*, and in this context he is in full agreement with the Masonic writers from whom we have just quoted, whether French, like Oswald Wirth, English, like Wilmshurst, or American, like Albert Pike; whether "regular" or "irregular", to use Mr. Mellor's terms.

Then comes the second stage in the activities of Masonry—secret activity outside the lodges—which consists in spreading and implanting throughout the world the philosophical ideas of Freemasonry under a general cover of humanitarianism.

This work is accomplished by secret infiltration and the undercover circulation of ideas, by means of a technique admirably described for

us by the Freemason Regis, when speaking at the Convent of the Grand Orient in 1928:

"Under the Grand Orient's influence, and in the calm and silence of our Temples, we should study all the most important questions affecting the life of communities, of the Nation, and of Humanity at large. Our Brethren will be thoroughly well-informed; they will leave the Temple well-instructed, fully equipped for the struggle ahead. They will leave behind them their aprons and their outward insignia of Masonry; they will go down into the city just as ordinary citizens, but each one will be thoroughly steeped in our outlook, and each, in his own profane circle, in his party or his union, will act according to his conscience—yet, I repeat, he will be saturated in the teaching he has received.

"Rich will be the result—not because it is occult, but because the influence of Masonry will gradually seep in everywhere; to the bewilderment of the profane world, the same spirit and the same unity of action will force their way to the front, and, as in a well-constructed syllogism, a certain conclusion bearing fateful consequences will gradually emerge and impose itself on its profane environment.

"Over and above all our other loyalties, a power we cannot deny governs us; that power is the spiritual power called Freemasonry.

"And why not follow these proud thoughts to their logical conclusion? Because we know more, because we have worked along sounder lines, than the mass of those who belong to profane groups, it is almost inevitable that we should take over their leadership. Let us not hide our light under a bushel; to a large extent it has already happened, and thus many profane bodies are without question receiving an infusion of our warm, living blood. I am perfectly well aware that we do, discreetly, form the elite in all the big social and political parties, and that thus we are sure of being able to control their policy. It is our duty—I repeat, our duty—to make sure that we control the politicians who are elected, that we right their wrongs, and show them their mistakes, and reproach them for what they have failed to do. In a word, Freemasonry should be the 'politician's conscience'."

(Brother Regis, Convent of the Grand Orient 1928, p. 256)

Finally, we come to the third stage in the work of Masonry, that of its direct intervention in politics.

This is how Leo XIII described it in his Encyclical of 19th March, 1902:

"Freemasonry is the permanent personification of the Revolution;

it constitutes a sort of society in reverse whose aim is to exercise an occult overlordship upon society as we know it, and whose sole raison d'être consists in waging war against God and His Church."

(Encyclical: On the 25th Year of Our Pontificate)

It is instructive, in this context, to compare the conclusion of the famous Pope with the following passages from the equally renowned Freemason, Oswald Wirth:

"The cause of Freemasonry became identified with the cause of the Republic, and if electoral campaigns sometimes did absorb too much time in the affairs of the lodges, the reason is that all friends of progress, seeking to strike a final blow at clericals and reactionaries, rallied together under the banner of Masonry."

(O. Wirth: *Le Livre de l'Apprenti*, p. 80)

"If at these moments of civil distress, the lodges had limited themselves to what we may call their normal peacetime occupation, they would have failed in their most sacred duty, for they would have been refusing to defend that heritage of liberties conquered by our valiant ancestors. It is to their honour that they have broken their rule, launching themselves with all haste into the political arena. They formed themselves into electoral committees to save the Republic, forgetful for the moment of that lofty humanitarian philosophy whose cultivation is the basic aim of Freemasonry."

(O. Wirth: *L'Ideal Initiatique*, p. 82)

Freemasonry has played a leading part in international politics, and especially in all the revolutionary movements which have shaken Europe and the world since 1789: in 1830, 1848, and 1871 in France; in 1848 and 1917 elsewhere in Europe, to mention only the most important instances. Freemasonry boasts of having been both the inspiration and the secret ruler of the Third Republic in France (1870-1939), and it is Freemasonry which has always been in the vanguard of the struggle against the Catholic Church in France, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Austria—or, in a word, wherever the Church was the religion of the country. We do not propose to re-write that history here, nor even to summarise Freemasonry's political activities; we only mention it to remind the reader that this is a factor which must be taken into account. (For a complete study of this question, see Leon de Poncins: *The Secret Powers behind Revolution*.)

But one point which we must emphasise in this context is the secrecy surrounding all these activities.

Freemasonry is practically never mentioned in the Press; history

books are silent about the power and influence of the Order, and governments and parliaments never dare debate such a dangerous subject. Reports of Masonic meetings and Congresses are not available to the public; Masonic magazines and publications are not placed in the Bibliotheque Nationale or the British Museum, although the law of the land demands it.

In general, we can say that Freemasonry has succeeded in keeping its political activities secret. But no secret can be kept indefinitely, and it is nearly always possible to discover the Masonic origins of such and such a political decision—only by that time it is usually too late to hinder it. We have chosen the following examples from history to illustrate this point:

The peace treaty of 1918 was directly inspired by Masonry. Its clauses had been worked out at a great international Masonic conference which took place on 28th, 29th and 30th June, 1917, at the headquarters of the Grand Orient of France in the Rue Cadet, Paris. This conference was attended by representatives of the leading lodges of allied and neutral countries—Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Serbia, Spain, Portugal, Argentina, Brazil, the United States (whence two lodges in Arkansas and Ohio, unrepresented, sent cordial greetings) and so on; only the Grand Lodge of England was unrepresented. In 1936 the complete minutes of this meeting came to light and were published in their entirety, accompanied by a detailed commentary, in Leon de Poncin's: *La Societe Acs Nations—Super-Etat Macon-nique*, from which all the information and documents in the following paragraphs have been taken.

Preparations for the Congress in June were put in hand at an earlier one in January 1917, as the minutes of the subsequent meeting relate:

"In sending you the summary of minutes of the Conference of the Masonic Jurisdictions of the Allied Nations, which was held at Paris on 14th and 15th January, 1917, as well as the resolutions and the manifesto therein adopted, it is our privilege to inform you that this Congress decided to hold a Masonic Congress at the Grand Orient of France, in Paris, on 28th, 29th and 30th of June next.

"The object of this Congress will be to investigate the means of elaborating the Constitution of the League of Nations, so as to prevent the recurrence of a catastrophe similar to the one at present raging which has plunged the civilised world in mourning.

"It was the opinion of this conference that this programme cannot be discussed solely by the Freemasonry of the Allied Nations, and that it is a matter also for the Masonic bodies of the

neutral nations to bring what light they can to the discussion of so grave a problem. . . .

"It is the duty of Freemasonry at the close of the cruel drama now being played out, to make its great and humanitarian voice heard, and to guide the nations towards a general organisation which will become their safeguard. It would be wanting in its duty, and false to its great principles, were it to remain silent. . . .

"It is clearly understood that the Masonic Congress will confine itself entirely to the humanitarian field, and that, in conformity with our Masonic Constitutions, it will not touch on any question of a political nature.

"We would be very grateful to receive from you the assurance of your support with the least possible delay...."

(Leon de Poncins; *La Societe des Nations*, pp. 65-67)

The Conference opened at half-past two on 28th June, 1917, with Brother Corneau, who was President of the Grand Orient of France, in the chair. He began the meeting with a speech, in the course of which he said:

"This Masonic Congress of the Allied and neutral Nations has come at the right time. We all know the disasters of the past; now we must build the happy city of the future. It is to undertake this truly Masonic work that we have invited you here. . . .

"What are we faced with? This war, which was unleashed by the military autocracies, has become a formidable quarrel in which the democracies have organised themselves against the despotic military powers....

"Thus it is absolutely indispensable to create a supranational authority, whose aim will be not to suppress the causes of conflicts, but peacefully to resolve the differences between nations.

"Freemasonry, which labours for peace, intends to study this new organism, the League of Nations. Freemasonry will be the propaganda agent for this conception of universal peace and happiness. That, my Most Illustrious Brethren, is our work. Let us set to it.

(Leon de Poncins, *ibid.*, pp. 70-71)

Brother Corneau then gave the chair to Brother Andre Lebey, Secretary of the Council of the Grand Orient of France, who read out his report on the Constitution of the League of Nations, a lengthy document, in which he said:

"The great war of 1914 . . . has gradually and continually brought into definition itself the character of the struggle, which is revealed as one between two opposing principles: Democracy

and Imperialism, Liberty and Authority, Truth proving its good faith, and Falsehood plunging deeper and deeper into shady intrigues . . . (throughout the war) there is not one event which has failed to bear witness to this gigantic duel between two hostile principles.

(Leon de Poncins, *ibid.*, pp. 75-76)

"We are invited to succeed in the work which was compromised by the Holy Alliance, by reason of its principles, which are contrary to ours, and through the universal but guaranteed reconciliation of men, to make manifest the proof of our principles. We will crown the work of the French Revolution.

(Leon de Poncins, *ibid.*, pp. 84-85)

"The more one studies the present situation, the more one realises that the abdication of the Hohenzollerns is the means of attaining the League of Nations. It is not for us, my Brethren, to define or demarcate the conditions of peace . . . but we can at least indicate the four principal points which we consider necessary:

- (1) The return to France of Alsace-Lorraine;
- (2) The reconstitution of Poland by the re-unification of its three separate parts;
- (3) The independence of Bohemia;
- (4) In principle, the liberation or unification of all the nations which are today oppressed by the political and administrative organisation of the Hapsburg Empire into States which the said nations shall select by a referendum. . . ."

(Leon de Poncins, *ibid.*, pp. 95-97)

This speech was greeted with applause, and Brother Corneau proposed the nomination of a Commission to examine the conclusions of Brother Lebey's report. In the opinion of Brother Nathan of the Grand Orient of Italy, the Committee should only deal with the Charter of the League of Nations, and discuss and vote upon the articles of which this Charter is composed, which was the principal object of the reunion of the Congress.

The second session opened the following day at half-past three. The conclusions presented by Brother Lebey on behalf of the Commission were adopted by the Congress. They contained, among others, the following resolutions:

"The unity, autonomy and independence of each nation is inviolable. A people which is not free, that is to say, a people which does not possess the liberal and democratic institutions indispensable to its development, cannot constitute a Nation.

"International legislative power is to reside in a Parliament. Just as the Constituent Assembly in 1789 drew up the Table of the Rights of Man, its first care will be to draw up the Table of the Rights of Nations, the charter guaranteeing their rights and their duties. (Leon de Poncins, *ibid.*, pp. 106-107)

Brother Urbain proposed that these resolutions should be sent to all the Governments of the Allied and Neutral Nations, and this was adopted. Then, after the resolution of the Italian delegation had been laid before the delegates, Brother Meoni of the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Italy read the following report:

"Reality . . . shows us that there exists one unique and supreme necessity: future humanity must be established on absolutely new foundations, secured by the conclusion of solemn treaties which should include the creation of an international Court of law, effectively supported by an international force. Thus, the reconstitution of Europe and the humanity of the morrow cannot be abandoned to the whim of dynasties, diplomats, and ruling class interests.

"It is obvious that we are confronted with two diverse and antipathetic conceptions of the nature and functions of the State. On the one hand is the imperialist idea, which despises the rights of peoples and is today represented by the preying empires which unleashed the criminal aggression, and on the other hand, the democratic idea, which asserts these same rights.

"Hence the necessity, for the peace of the world, that the conception of an aggressive military hegemony be destroyed. How will this result be achieved? Doubtless, through the integral triumph of the principle of nationalities. 'National life', wrote Joseph Mazzini, 'is the means; international life is the end'. The whole destiny of Europe and of the new humanity is involved in the resolution of this problem of nationality. After the failure of the German plan will come the Federation of the United States of Europe, by liberty and by right.

"How, then, will this end be achieved?

"Firstly, by the suppression of all despotism . . . and secondly, by the regulation of international conflicts by arbitration."

Brother Meoni then read the resolution of the Italian delegation which, among other things, affirmed:

"The unflinching determination of all the Masonic Powers represented at the Congress . . . to see that nations which had

been shattered or even obliterated by long centuries of despotism and militarism . . . had the right to reconstitute themselves."

(Leon de Poncins, *ibid.*, pp. 110-115)

After discussions, this resolution was adopted, and the Congress then approved the following motions:

"This Congress sends to Mr. Wilson, President of the United States, the homage of its admiration and the tribute of its recognition of the great services he has rendered Humanity.

"Declares that it is happy to collaborate with President Wilson in this work of international justice and democratic fraternity, which is Freemasonry's own ideal,

"And affirms that the eternal principles of Freemasonry are completely in harmony with those proclaimed by President Wilson for the defence of civilisation and the liberty of peoples. . . ."

In the third motion, the Congress:

"Declares that faithful to their traditions, and like their glorious ancestors, the Freemasons today are still the devoted labourers of the emancipation of the human race,

"Warmly appeals to all the Brethren for their support in the task of bringing into being the League of Nations, which alone can guarantee the future and the liberty of peoples, and international justice and law."

(Leon de Poncins, *ibid.*, pp. 117-118)

With this passage we end the quotations from the Minutes of the Congress, but it is worth inserting at this point, as a conclusion which effectively sums up the above, Brother Andre Lebey's communication to the Council of the Order on 9th December, 1917.

"It is a question of knowing which is right: good faith or lies, Good or Evil, Liberty or Autocracy. The present conflict is the continuation of that which began in 1789, and one of these two principles must triumph or die. The very life of the world is at stake. Can Humanity live in freedom; is it worthy of it? Or is it fated to live in slavery? That is the vital question in the present catastrophe, and all the democracies have given their answer.

"There is no question of retreat or compromise. In a war in which the opposing principles are so clearly and distinctly defined, no one could hesitate as to his duty. Not to defend our country would be to surrender the Republic. Our country and our Republic, Socialism and the spirit of Revolution, these are inseparably bound together."

(Leon de Poncins, *ibid.*, p. 62)

Weigh these texts carefully word for word, and it will be found

that they actually assert the incredible theory that, while the rights of each nation are inviolable, nevertheless a people which is governed by an autocratic regime does not constitute a nation ! In other words, Freemasonry accords its protection to all peoples except those who evade its own democratic and revolutionary law, and the League of Nations, denying all rights to nations whose political regime was not considered sufficiently democratic, under the influence of Masonry became an organ for control and coercion at the service of its international policy. Thus when the conflict between Italy and Ethiopia broke out, the League of Nations unhesitatingly took sides against Italy.

A number of other important conclusions flow from the revelations contained in these texts.

Firstly, as we have seen the Masonic Congress of 1917 opened by loudly proclaiming that it would not discuss any question relating to politics. But it proceeded to discuss the means of elaborating the Constitution of the League of Nations and guiding the nations towards a general organisation which would become their safeguard, the abdication of the Hohenzollerns, the principal points necessary for inclusion in the peace treaty, the establishment of future humanity on absolutely new foundations, the destruction of aggressive military hegemonies, the reconstitution of Europe in the Federation of the United States of Europe, the regulation of international conflicts by arbitration, and so on, all of which are purely matters of the highest political interest to the nations of the world. These facts cannot be denied. It is apparent, therefore, that Freemasonry lies.

Next, as we have seen, the Congress declared its desire for the suppression of all despotism. But, as we relate in other chapters in this work, Freemasonry openly prepares the way for the triumph of Communism, than which no more accomplished system of despotism has yet been devised.

Indeed, in an article published in the secret Masonic review, *l'Acacia*, in 1910, Brother Hiram recognised that:

"... We have overthrown, undermined, destroyed and demolished with a fury that at times seemed blind."

And why have they done this? The reason, he says, is:

"so that we can rebuild in the best conditions with taste and solidarity. But," he goes on, "since the ground is littered all round us with ruins which are the result of our work, it is high time that we applied ourselves to learning our truly Masonic role as builders."

The whole tenor of the Masonic Congress of 1917 is permeated

with this idea of the destruction of the ancient world, upon which a new world is to be built inspired by Masonic principles.

Finally, it must be observed that all the conclusions adopted in the course of these talks at the Masonic Congress in 1917 became an integral part of the Treaty of Versailles two years later. Most important of all was the setting-up of the League of Nations which, in the light of the documents above, appears to have been a kind of Masonic supra-State.

Freemasonry was thus the chief beneficiary, in a political sense, of the First World War. Hers were the principles and hers the men who were in charge of European politics from 1918 to 1930. Mr. Coolidge, late president of the United States of America, publicly admitted as much when, in a speech at Hammond on 14th June, 1927, he said:

"The chief question at stake in this formidable conflict was to decide which form of government was to predominate among the great nations of the world: the autocratic form or the republican form. Victory finally remained on the side of the people."

(Reuter, London, 14th June, 1927)

The results were disastrous. The Treaty of Versailles quickly led to a widespread breakdown of order, to revolutionary unrest, to the opposing reactions of the Fascist and Hitler regimes, to the Spanish Civil War, and finally to the Second World War.

Now, apart from the initiates who were present at the Congress in 1917, no one at that time knew anything about the secret meeting, nor of the part it played in drawing up the Treaty of Versailles. It was only many years later that I was able to obtain the official report of the Conference, which I published in the afore-mentioned book in 1936. It is a frightening thought that an occult organisation, owing responsibility to no one, can direct the course of European politics without anyone being aware of the fact.

Our second example of the Masonic origins of political decisions is taken from the Left-wing coalition, or Cartel des Gauches, which was victorious in the 1924 elections in France, and brought M. Herriot to power. The Convent of the Grand Orient that year sent him a loyal address:

"Before we begin, allow me to send greetings from all Freemasons to our great citizen Herriot, who, although not himself a Freemason, is so successful in putting into practice our Masonic ideas."

His government introduced a series of Socialist laws which proved to be a foretaste of Leon Blum's Popular Front.

But not long after the Cartel des Gauches came to power, a most remarkable book was brought out by the Spes publishing house under the pseudonym of A. G. Michel. His *La Dictature de la Franc-Maçonnerie sur la France* provides some of the most complete documentation ever produced on the activities of Masonry in politics. Freemasonry, as will be shown from its own statutes, led the campaign which brought the Cartel des Gauches to power, and initiated in secret in the lodges practically all the laws subsequently passed by the Herriot administration. The documents we reproduce below are taken from Michel's book.

First of all, Freemasonry organised and co-ordinated the left-wing parties:

"On the eve of the legislative elections, what is needed by the Republicans? It is that the countersign be sent forth by the Grand Orient of France. ... It is incumbent upon Freemasonry to give the countersign. It should be listened to; Freemasons should be the liaison agents of future victories. You can do it. It is up to you to vanquish the delegates of the National Coalition."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1923, p. 315)

"Thus we must organise the defence of the Republic. It is through the union of the Left, of which the lodge will be the cell, that we will triumph. We must bring together all republicans of good will, and even join with the Communists in adopting a programme to which all efforts can be made to rally."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, pp. 236-237)

"Surely Masonry, which brings together in its bosom republicans of all shades of opinion, is specially designated to bring to an end the divisions which exist in the avant-garde parties? Fraternally united on our columns, why shouldn't we be even more so outside our temples, in order to ensure the defence of Democracy and Freedom of Thought against the clerical and reactionary coalition?"

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, p. 266)

The next step centred round the struggle for power. Freemasonry had no illusions about its objective, which was:

"To get rid of the present Chamber of Deputies."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, p. 104)

"The democratic idea has been imperilled by the resurgent and cunning schemes of clerical reaction. Have we any chance of hoping for a favourable intervention from our present leaders?"

...I declare that our present leaders are visibly held prisoner by clerical and capitalist reaction. . . ."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1923, p. 308)

"We, who want to raise up France for the Republic and Peace, by the Republic and Peace, we are resolved to take over power from the National Coalition in order to bring the country the remedies and the well-being which it has the right to expect from a majority which has set out to restore it."

(Lecture "La Faillite ou la Republique", by J. Schmidt,
Deputy for the Oise, given at the Lodge
Action Socialiste, 7th February, 1924)

How was Freemasonry to achieve this objective? A campaign of propaganda and penetration was organised throughout the country. Michel shows from Masonic documents how the lodges were instructed to study and prepare public opinion, and to conduct what can best be described as Masonic public-opinion polls throughout the country to determine the best ways of uniting Left-wing parties to combat the clerical reactionaries. Very considerable attention was devoted to the Press.

"The Convent of the Grand Lodge of France protests against every manoeuvre of a coalition of big papers preventing the diffusion of Left-wing papers, and thus creating a monopoly which destroys the liberty of the Press. Freemasons have a duty to employ all practical means to oppose these intolerable schemes."

(Convent of the Grand Lodge of France, 1923, p. 94)

"Circular No. 5 concerns propaganda through the Press, and asks lodges to bring to our attention the names of papers likely to publish reports of the Grand Orient, and information on their regularity, their clientele, the quantity of their circulation, and their political sympathies ... so that the Council may send them whatever communication they think fit . . . and to enquire among the republican Press upon whose support Freemasonry could rely if necessary. . . . Our largest financial support must be reserved for the Press which is republican in outlook."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, pp. 372-374)

"The Departmental Press . . . which has preserved the flame of republican opinion ... is the best guardian of our tradition. . . . The Convent asks the Council to draw the attention of the lodges to the experiment of the lodges in Lower Normandy, which have set up a weekly paper entirely edited by Masons, and to call upon the lodges to follow this example, following different local circum-

stances, and set up papers throughout the whole of France produced entirely under our control."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, pp. 374, 380)

Individuals were also encouraged, under the strict supervision of the Order, to produce their own propaganda.

"When a serious, interesting and instructive work has been written by a Brother, the lodge should not hesitate to have it printed, without revealing its identity. As far as written propaganda is concerned, the Commission is of the opinion that pamphlets and tracts provide the most immediate and fruitful means through which to radiate our ideas. We must ask Freemasons to let us sift everything that they intend to say or write with our fraternal criticism."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, pp. 274, 279, 385)

"Written propaganda, coupled with the personal influence of Brethren belonging to the Press, should be increased by oral propaganda in the form of white meetings and conferences . . . public conferences, white meetings and fetes, are regarded as a good means of propaganda by the lodges . . . they are more useful than can be imagined, for the guests are select people who become, in their turn, excellent propagandists."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, pp. 269, 276, 387)

All this concerted campaign was not without its effect, and indeed in the following year we find the lodges congratulating themselves on the success of their work:

"Masonic propaganda, we learn with joy, is making itself felt everywhere, in the most happy circumstances. Soon we will see the awakening of republican opinion in this country."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1923, p. 305)

Finally, in 1924, Masonry's efforts met with success, the Cartel des Gauches came into power, and thereafter promulgated a whole succession of laws, almost every one of which had previously been suggested in the lodges:

(1) The lodges demanded the suppression of the French Embassy at the Vatican.

"The order of the day comprised two distinct parts: the former was a protest by the Grand Lodge of France against the renewal of relations with the Vatican, for it is evident that if this renewal, as we fear, takes place, it will begin a movement of regression

against the laws of laicisation which we have had so much trouble to get passed by the Chamber."

(Bulletin Officiel of the Grand Lodge of France, September, 1920, « 14, and many other sources which we have not the space to reproduce here.)

On 17th June, 1924, M. Herriot declared that "we have decided not to maintain an Embassy at the Vatican", and on 24th October, 1924, the Embassy was suppressed.

(2) The lodges requested that the law on religious bodies should be enforced.

"The lodge Le Travail Ecossais of Dijon . . . demands, and with reason, that our parliamentary Brethren request the Government to apply the law and to forbid members of Congregations which are seeking to re-establish themselves in France to teach, either in groups or individually, profiting from the inertia or reactionary attitude of the present Chamber."

(Bulletin Officiel of the Grand Lodge of France,
Convent 1922, p. 220, among others)

On 17th June, 1924, M. Herriot declared: "We have decided . . . to apply the law on the Congregations", and on 27th September, he told the French Cardinals, "As far as the religious congregations are concerned, Your Eminences should not be surprised that the Government defends the law and remains bound to it." This was followed by various enforcements of the law.

(3) The lodges desired to see the triumph of laicism.

"It is in the defence of the school and of the spirit of laicism that we will find the programme which can and should bind together the whole Republican party."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1923, p. 255)

"The question which is more than ever important today is to study and apply rapid, energetic and decisive measures to defend the work of laicisation accomplished by the Republic."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, p. 219, and other sources.)

On 17th June, 1924, M. Herriot declared: "The idea of laicisation, as we conceive it, comprises the safeguard of national and fraternal unity." This was followed by various enforcements of the law.

(4) The lodges demanded a general free pardon for all traitors and those under sentence of death, notably Marty, Sadoul (both notorious Communist leaders), Caillaux, Malvy, Goldsky and others. (See, among other sources, a Grand Conference "Pour l'Amnistie" held at

the headquarters of the Grand Orient on 31st January, 1923, Bulletin Hebdomadaire, No. 339, 1923, p. 13.)

On 15 th July, 1924, a vote of pardon was passed in the Chamber by 325 to 185.

(5) The lodges protested against the Orders in Council (Grand Lodge of France, February to April 1924, pp. 209-210), and M. Herriot declared, on 17th June, 1924: "In order to re-establish the guarantees to which all are entitled, we ask you to suppress the Orders in Council."

(6) The lodges requested a constituency poll (See, among other sources, the Grand Lodge of France, 1922, p. 287), M. Herriot made a statement about it on 17th June, 1924, and the desired action was voted on 23rd August by 232 votes to 32 in the Senate.

(7) The lodges demanded the enforcement of the principle of laicisation in Alsace-Lorraine, in spite of promises previously given to the contrary. (See, among other sources, the 1923 Convent of the Grand Orient, p. 271.) M. Herriot made a statement on 17th June, 1924, which was followed by various enforcements.

(8) The lodges demanded the establishment of a single type of school and the monopoly of education.

"The principle of the single type of school, whereby all children, to whatever social class they belong, are brought together under the same system of teaching, seems to flow naturally from the conceptions laid down by the revolutionaries in 1789 and 1793."

(Convent of the Grand Lodge of France, 1923, p. 46)

On 17th June, 1924, M. Herriot said: "Democracy will not be completely secure in our country while the availability of places for secondary education is determined by the wealth of the parents instead of the merit of the children."

This was followed by various enforcements.

(9) The lodges requested that France should resume diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia (Bulletin Officiel of the Grand Lodge of France, October 1922, p. 286), M. Herriot declared, on 17th June, 1924: "We are preparing as from today to renew normal relations with Russia", and this was followed by the official resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union on 28th October, 1924.

(10) The lodges demanded that the economy should be organised so as to prepare the way for full-blooded Socialism.

"The practical realisation of the nationalisation of industry must be pursued by every possible means."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1923, p. 96, among other sources.)

On 17th June, 1924, M. Herriot declared: "The Government will develop the national production by all the means within its power ...instead of suppressing the State industries, we wish to modernise them." Details of the various enforcements carried out in this field are listed on pages 74-83 of A. G. Michel's *La Dictature de la Franc-Maçonnerie sur la France*.

(11) The lodges adopted a policy of emancipation and laicisation with regard to the colonies (See the Convent of the Grand Orient of France, 1923, p. 247, among other sources), the implementation of which is described in A. G. Michel's book (*ibid.*, pp. 91-94).

(12) The lodges expressed hostility to discipline in the Army.

"From the point of view of the Army, no citizen ought to be called up for any time longer than is strictly necessary for his instruction. In time of war, the military Commander will be subordinate to the civil authorities ... the military law courts will be suppressed. ..."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1922, pp. 142-143)

On 17th June, 1924, M. Herriot declared: "We propose to reorganise the Army ... so as to reduce active military service in such a way that France will never at any moment find herself unprepared and weakened", and this was enforced in various ways.

(13) The lodges support the League of Nations.

"The League of Nations which we desire will have all the more real moral force and influence as it will be able to depend on the support of Masonic Associations throughout the entire world."

(Resolution of the Grand Lodge of France, 1923, p. 97)

"It is the duty of universal Freemasonry to give its absolute support to the League of Nations, so that it no longer has to be subject to the partisan influences of Governments. ..."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1923, p. 23)

"The principal tasks of the League of Nations consists in organising . . . the extension of a general pacifist education, relying, especially, on the development of an international language . . . the creation of a European spirit, and a patriotism loyal to the League of Nations, in short, the formation of the United States of Europe, or rather the Federation of the World."

(Convent of the Grand Lodge of France, 1922, pp. 235-236)

On 17th June, 1924, M. Herriot declared: "We will do everything in our power to strengthen the League of Nations"; subse-

quently he achieved the recognition of the principle of arbitration by the League of Nations at the London Conference, and the League was further enhanced when M. Herriot and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, attended sessions in September, 1924.

The third example of the secret, Masonic origin of a political decision is the Conference of Yalta.

In spite of belated reservations on the part of Churchill, the Yalta agreements were concluded between President Roosevelt and Stalin in the strictest secrecy and without the knowledge of the American people. (see Chapter 9).

These agreements were a complete diplomatic disaster for the West. Roosevelt yielded to Stalin, without anything being given in return, half Europe and a large part of Asia.

Since then, certain documents have been published in America showing that Benes played a large part in drawing up the details of the Yalta agreement. As a Freemason, Benes always enjoyed considerable influence over Roosevelt; both were high-degree initiates; it was Benes who convinced Roosevelt of the necessity of placing such blind trust in Stalin; and Benes was always a fervid admirer of Stalin, an admiration which eventually led to the loss of his country and indirectly cost him his life.

Let us confine ourselves to these three examples of Masonry's influence on politics, though it would not be difficult to quote others.

From all this we must conclude: it is a frightening thought that an occult organisation, owing responsibility to no one, can thus in secret direct the policies of one country or of a group of countries.

Those Presidents, Ministers and deputies who are Masons keep their membership of the Order as far as possible secret. They never advertise the fact that they are Masons when facing their constituents or their Cabinets.

Nevertheless, as Masons, they have taken an oath of secrecy, and for all practical purposes, of obedience. What will happen, then, if a conflict arises between their duty to their country and their secret loyalty to the Masonic Order—in other words, if there is a conflict between the interests of the Nation and the interests of Freemasonry? Which will win? Which will carry the most weight? For any country, such a situation is fraught with peril.

This is why so many governments, Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, Moslem and others, have officially banned Freemasonry. The problem has arisen once more in Soviet Russia. There is a brief account of it in the Freemason Vinatrel's book, *Communisme et Franc-Maçonnerie*.

The Communists accept aid and friendship from Freemasonry

whenever they are offered, but they take good care that Communism is not infiltrated and taken over by Masonry.

"As the doctrines, policies and discipline of Communism are constantly confronted by the doctrines, morals and traditions of Freemasonry, the Freemason who is also a Communist finds himself in a dilemma—shall he remain faithful to his party and betray Masonry, or remain faithful to the Masonic ideal and renounce his party ?

"On one particular point (among many others), the Communist Party can charge any member of the party who is also a Mason with perjury. At his initiation, the Freemason takes a solemn oath never to reveal anything which he may have heard, said or done. He is so bound in honour.

"To which the Communist Party replies: 'The Communist Party could never allow any of its members to join in secret activities the nature of which is hidden from the Party, all the more so if the member is a militant Party worker.'

"This statement was published by Andre Fajon in *l'Humanite*, the central organ of the French Communist Party, on Friday, 19th September, 1952, in the name of the Bureau Politique of the French Communist Party."

(G. Vinatrel: *Communisme et Franc-Maçonnerie*, pp. 139-140)

Freemasonry imposes a rigid discipline on its members, and the various Grand Lodges, at least, are strict on one point: Freemasons occupying political posts owe obedience, above all else, to the orders and directives of Masonry. The Order does not always manage to obtain this unconditional obedience, but it always insists upon it as the Mason's duty.

"As soon as a Freemason is elected to the Chamber of Deputies he has this imperative duty: to remember that he is still a Mason and that he must always act as a Mason. But since, as we realise, many have failed to adhere to this standard, the Commission asks you to demand this oath of any Freemason seeking entry to politics: that he will join and assiduously attend all meetings of the Brethren in his Assembly, and that while he is there he will always be inspired by the purest spirit of Masonry."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1928, p. 255)

"When a Freemason is received into a lodge, he takes an oath. If he is a Deputy, he is responsible to his constituents, but he is also responsible to us.

"We do not want politicians who are Masons to adopt a dual attitude: one which they display in Parliament, and the other in the lodges. We do not want to see politicians having a foot in both camps: one in the lodge, and one in the Bishop's palace."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1929, p. 48)

"Politicians who are Masons, and who are consequently in some degree emissaries of the Order, should remain subject to it during their term of office. As politicians, they must be guided by the work of the general Assembly, but in every circumstance of their political life they have a duty to obey those principles which govern us."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1923, p. 365)

"Those Freemasons holding public office have a duty to apply the principles of Masonry, and those of them who have been invested with an electoral mandate—either sought by themselves or approved and tacitly invested in them by their Brethren—have, for all the more reason, a duty exceeding that of all other Masons, never to forget those Masonic principles which have fashioned their personality or their political fortunes."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1923, p. 365)

"It is in our Lodges that our Brethren will acquire a philosophical spirit. Let us guard it lovingly, for it is the secret of political influence. Our strength lies in this silent resource of which past generations of Masons set us such an example as they worked to establish that ideal which we hold in common."

"Quite apart from the organisation of the lodges, I would like to give you a rapid summary, as I see it, of the organisation and exercise of power, such as we should bear in mind. We must exercise constant control; we must hear and question all those of our Brethren who, by their professions, touch on politics, the law or administration. . . .

". . . Democracy must of necessity directly exercise control of power through our lodges and through those of our Brethren who are Senators or Deputies. It is through such supervision that the organisation of a Democracy progresses. . . ."

(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1924, p. 442)

"Without seeking to intervene in party disputes, the Convent finds its trust persistently betrayed by Masons in Parliament, and condemns those who have not the courage, when voting, to apply the ideas which they display when they are in the Temples. It calls on them, in the higher cause of Masonry and the Republic,

to choose between their electoral interests and their duty to Masonry."
(Convent of the Grand Orient, 1930, p. 50)

We shall conclude this brief survey of the work of Freemasonry with the official report of the Extraordinary General Assembly of the Spanish Grand Orient, held at Madrid on 20th February, 1932, and on several days following.

The evidence you are about to read is of capital importance, for it provides proof of the close supervision exercised by Masonry over those of its members who occupy political posts, and of the strict obedience it demands of them—an obedience on oath to secret directive, for failing which they are liable to Masonic justice.

The importance of the last point is that Freemasonry has denied that it holds its members to account for failing to obey its directives, but this document provides irrefutable proof that this is precisely what it does do.

The document was originally published by the author in full in the *Revue Internationale des Societes secretes* on 15th December, 1933. Here, we have reproduced the principal passages:

Official Bulletin of the Spanish Grand Orient, Madrid, 10th September, 1932, VIth year, No. 64, page 13:

"Decisions taken at the Extraordinary General Assembly of the Spanish Grand Orient on 20th February, 1932, and succeeding days.

"First motion on the Agenda

"(2) All Freemasons of the Spanish Grand Orient will confirm their oath according to the rank they hold; those absent or impeded will do so in any suitable way, and those present, at the first meeting of their lodge. The Venerable Master will warn the Freemasons that they must renew their oath, verbally or in writing, to be always ready to appear before their respective judges in order to explain and justify the correctness of their Masonic conduct in every aspect of their Masonic or secular life.

"(7) The Lodges and Triangles will file a report on each Freemason, on which will be recorded his actual work, the posts he holds or has held in the State or private enterprise, and the reasons for his leaving; as also a record of his meritorious services and Masonic achievements. This file must be specially complete and specific for those Masons holding a political post through popular vote or by Government nomination, such as councillors, deputies, etc. . . . The said files will be sent to the Grand Lodge of the district concerned, to be transmitted to the C.P. of the G.S.F.C.

"Second motion on the Agenda

"(11a) The Masonic authorities are bound to see to it that, as

often as necessary, Freemasons holding public positions renew their oaths to explain and justify their conduct as Masons before their superiors. And since, in carrying out public duties, a Mason may transgress Masonic rules by act or omission, it is evident that such a Mason will be bound not only to explain and justify those actions that seem culpable or doubtful, but also to receive Masonic rules of conduct and to observe them.

"(b) Freemasons in public posts must be reminded of their duty of charity and fraternal tolerance, and care must be taken that this spirit of Masonic brotherhood remains above all differences of opinion which may separate them in political contests.

"(c) All this supervision, help and collaboration will depend on the Lodge of the Degree concerned, and should be carried out in a spirit of absolute respect for the political views of Masonic Brothers, without the slightest trace of partisan spirit, but solely for the defence of the great principles of our August Order.

"(13) In order to be able to determine correctly the immediate or remote projects of Freemasonry, this Assembly should not limit its scope merely to drawing up rules regarding certain concrete facts, but it is its business especially to ratify, recall to mind and to explain the fundamental principles which guide the whole movement.

"And this we must do in the religious, political and social spheres.

"It is the function of this Assembly to recall and explain the Masonic principles which, in these three spheres, should inspire the work of Spanish Masonry today and in the future.

"Work in the religious sphere is the most important thing. It is the foundation of all the others, since every political and social doctrine must be erected on an ethical foundation, which in turn is based on metaphysics, or an attempt to explain the order of the the world—such an explanation constituting a religion in the widest and noblest sense of the word."

From our study of the Masonic documents from which we have quoted in the course of this chapter, there emerges one very clear conclusion.

Contrary to what those who defend Freemasonry claim, it is evident that secrecy, as observed under different forms and within the different spheres of Masonry's activity, is of vital importance to the Order, for without it, Masonry would simply be just another political party among many, and it would lose its subtle and formidable efficiency, which has turned it into a first-class instrument in the service of subversion.

JUDAISM AND FREEMASONRY

THE affinities between Jewry and Freemasonry have often been described in works on Freemasonry, and in this respect perhaps Mgr. Jouin can claim to have revealed the greatest understanding and knowledge of this formidable problem in his remarkable works. Mellor, nevertheless, considers that the very theme itself is absurd and iniquitous, and he ascribes its origin to the ignorance, stupidity and bad faith of antimasons.

"Antimasonry, which had not thought of mobilizing the Devil in the service of the publishers until the middle of the nineteenth century, left the Jews in peace for just a little longer. Their turn was to come, however. The Cremieux Decree of 1871 (by which Algerian Jews became full French citizens, whereas Algerian Arabs were only French subjects), the prosperity of the House of Rothschild in the world of finance, the bitterness stored up against Lord Beaconsfield (Disraeli), and the Dreyfus affair above all, revived that mental illness which flares up at certain periods of human history, dies down, then erupts again, like a volcano, and which is called anti-Semitism.

(A. Mellor: *Our Separated Brethren*, p. 263)

"The last quarter of the nineteenth century saw the birth of a neologism, judeo-masonry, and the rapid growth of anti-judeo-masonic writing. . . .

"A dogma was born: that Freemasons were merely puppets whose strings were pulled by the Jews. There were even caricatures to illustrate this brilliant discovery, inevitably depicting a Jew with an extraordinary nose and a fez on his head, manipulating a marionette dressed in the Masonic apron and sash.

"Some believed that Freemasonry had been made up by the Jews, as was proved by the names of Elias Ashmole, Martinez de Pasqually, the Elus Coens, and by the taste of the higher degrees in past times for the Kabbala. Some people even exhumed that old, old story according to which a Jew was at the source of every heresy. Others 'proved' Jewish origin through masonic symbolism

(Solomon's Temple, pillars J and B, etc.). The idea of a Puritan origin based on English Biblism didn't occur to anyone. The wisest people were content to accuse an 'anti-Christian union' between Jewish high finance and the Masonic politics of the Third Republic. The latter definitely existed, incidentally, but it was no less definite that the Jewish Freemasons in business circles and political committees were by no means religious Jews; quite the opposite.

"The height of bad faith was reached, beyond any doubt, with the famous legend of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which was a criminal forgery.

"The Jews at first noticed with astonishment the strange paternity attributed to them. But eventually they saw it as one more bee in the bonnet of the anti-Semites. Many, out of prudence, adopted a very careful attitude towards Masonry.

"In the twentieth century Nazi theories and the attempted genocide which they produced dealt 'anti-judeo-masonry' a mortal blow. Many decent Frenchmen who, previously, had broken out in written or spoken violence now found themselves face to face with reality, and were utterly confounded. In most of them the voice of a Christian conscience spoke a new language, much to their own surprise. They had never wanted torture of their adversary, nor extermination camps. Still less had they wanted the world made the slave of a paranoiac.

"That was the end of 'anti-judeo-masonry'."

(A. Mellor: *Our Separated Brethren*, pp. 263-265)

This passage represents a categorical assertion by Mellor; yet it is no more than an assertion, for no text, no document, and no fact whatever is adduced in support of it. It is flatly contradicted, on the other hand, by many Jewish and Masonic writers.

In a work written in 1914 and recently republished, and which, we are told, is a most important example of Jewish thinking, the Rabbi Elie Benamozegh tells us:

"What is certain is that Masonic theology corresponds well enough to that of the Kabbala. Moreover, a profound study of Rabbinical works in the first centuries of the Christian era provides abundant proof that the Haggada was the popular form of a secret science, whose methods of initiation bore the most striking resemblances to Freemasonry.

"Those who take the trouble to examine the question of the links between Judaism and philosophic Masonry and the mysteries in general, will, we are sure, lose some of their lofty contempt for the Kabbala."

(Rabbi Elie Benamozegh: *Israel et l'Humanite*, p. 73)

And the editors add, in a footnote at the bottom of the page:

"To those who may be surprised by the use of such an expression (Masonic theology), we would say that there is a Masonic theology in the sense that there exists in Freemasonry a secret, philosophic and religious doctrine, which was introduced by the Gnostic Rosicrucians at the time of their union with the Free Masons in 1717. This secret doctrine, or gnosis, belongs exclusively to the High, or philosophic, degrees of Freemasonry."

No less clear and categorical on this point is the great Jewish authority on anti-semitism, Bernard Lazare, who in his time defended Captain Dreyfus.

"What then was the connection between these secret societies and the Jews? The problem is a difficult one to solve, for respectable documentary evidence on the subject there is none. It is clear, however, that the Jews were not the dominant factors in these associations, as the writers whom I have just quoted would have it (Lazare refers to Barruel, Cretineau-Joly, Gougenot des Mousseaux, Dom Deschamps and Claudio Jannet); they were not 'necessarily the soul, the heads and the Grand-Masters of Freemasonry', as Gougenot des Mousseaux maintains. It is true, of course that there were Jews connected with Freemasonry from its birth, students of the Kabbala, as is shown by certain rites which survive. It is very probable, too, that in the years preceding the outbreak of the French Revolution, they entered in greater numbers than ever into the councils of the secret societies, becoming indeed themselves the founders of secret associations. There were Jews in the circle around Weishaupt, and a Jew of Portuguese origin, Martinez de Pasquales, established numerous groups of illuminati in France and gathered around him a large number of disciples whom he instructed in the doctrines of re-integration. The lodges which Martinez founded were mystic in character, whereas the other orders of Freemasonry were, on the whole, rationalistic in their teachings. This might almost lead one to say that the secret societies gave expression in a way to the twofold nature of the Jew in, on the one hand, a rigid rationalism, and on the other, that pantheism which beginning as the metaphysical reflection of the belief in one God, often ended in a sort of Kabbalistic theurgy. There would be little difficulty in showing how these two tendencies worked in harmony; how Cazotte, Cagliostro, Martinez, Saint-Martin, the Comte de Saint-Germain and Eckartshausen were practically in alliance with the Encyclopaedists and Jacobins,

and how both, in spite of their seeming hostility, succeeded in arriving at the same end, the undermining, namely, of Christianity. "This, too, then, would tend to show that though the Jews might very well have been active participants in the agitation carried on by the secret societies, it was not because they were the founders of such associations, but merely because the doctrines of the secret societies agreed so well with their own."

(B. Lazare: Antisemitism, pp. 308-309)

A third refutation of Mellor's assertion, showing that a large part of the very symbolism of Freemasonry is Jewish in origin, is taken from the pen of an English writer, who was probably Jewish, from a passage in which he concludes a study of this particular question:

"Although I have not, by any means, dealt with the Hebraic influences on all the symbolism of Masonry, I hope I have given sufficient illustrations to support the deduction that Masonry, as a system of symbolry, rests entirely on a foundation which is essentially Hebraic." (B. Shillman: Hebraic Influences on Masonic Symbolism, p. 31)

Elsewhere, the well-known historian Nesta Webster writes in her excellent work, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, that

"the masonic coat-of-arms still used by the Grand Lodge of England is undoubtedly of Jewish design",

and she continues, quoting from an article by Lucien Wolf, the Jewish historian and scholar, which appeared in the *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* (vol. II, p. 156):

" 'this coat is entirely composed of Jewish symbols and is an attempt to display heraldically the various forms of the Cherubim pictured to us in the second vision of Ezekiel—an Ox, a Man, a Lion and an Eagle—and thus belongs to the highest and most mystical domain of Hebrew symbolism.' "

"The fact remains," she concludes, "that when the ritual and constitutions of Masonry were drawn up in 1717, although certain fragments of the ancient Egyptian and Pythagorean doctrines were retained, the Judaic version of the secret tradition was the one selected by the founders of Grand Lodge on which to build up their system." (pp. 123-124)

We will now go on to compare Jewish and Masonic texts, and in the course of our study we shall often find that there is a basic affinity between them, both in doctrine and conception.

We set out below a few examples of their fundamental connection.

Firstly, at the 1902 Covent of the Grand Orient, Brother Delpech, who was Grand Master of the Grand Orient, delivered a speech in the course of which he said:

"The triumph of the Galilean has lasted twenty centuries. In his turn he is dying. That mysterious voice, which once cried: 'Great Pan is dead!' from the mountains of Epirus, is today proclaiming the end of that deceiving God who had promised an age of peace and justice to those who would believe in him. The illusion has lasted long enough; but the lying God is disappearing in his turn; he is going to take his place, amidst the dust of the ages, with those other divinities of India, Egypt, Greece and Rome, who saw so many deluded creatures prostrate themselves before their altars. Freemasons, we realise, not without joy, that we ourselves are no strangers to this downfall of false prophets. The Church of Rome, based on the Galilean myth, began to decline rapidly from the very day on which the Masonic association was established. From a political point of view, Freemasons have often differed among themselves. But at all times Freemasonry has stood firm on this principle—to wage war against all superstitions and against all forms of fanaticism."

Now let the reader compare this passage with another from the pen of a most distinguished Jewish writer, James Darmesteter, who was at work at the end of the first decade of the twentieth century. Like the Freemason Delpech, Darmesteter was fanatically opposed to Christianity. We quote a few typical passages from his *Prophetes d'Israel* as reproduced and commented upon in Andre Spire's *Quelques Juifs*, a book devoted to the modern prophets of Israel.

Darmesteter proclaims the end of Christianity. He shows us Christ, propelled by an invisible hand, rejoining in the pit of Sheol those other gods, brothers and victims of his, whom man had conceived before him and whom man had sacrificed to Christ out of obedience to his wishes.

"And a sigh passed over that world of chaos, and Hell shuddered to the deepest fibres of its roots.

"And a light shone in the night from all those burning eyes . . . and I saw a white spectre descending from afar off on high. He came—slowly, but without stopping or turning his head. It was Christ, the Son of Man, the Son of the Virgin ! . . .

"Hell also knew him, and Hell's thousand legions leapt forward to welcome their approaching guest. . . .

"And a tremendous shout burst from the throat of the pit:

"So you have come at last, Galilean ! So here you are, stricken, just as we are; no different from ourselves !"

"How did you fall from Heaven, Star of the Stars, Son of the Virgin? You, who used to say in your heart: I am God, world without end; I shall reign for eternity from the highest throne in Heaven, above the stars and the broken idols, and my name alone shall ring in men's ears."

"And now in turn your star has been cast down and broken, cedar of Lebanon, and you, the great mocker of dead gods, you too descend among the gods who live no more."

"Little has changed in the progress of the world. Nature is unmoved by the spectacle of this great defeat, and as always happens after events which seem to exceed the limits of tolerance assigned to her, she continues, indifferent, upon her eternal course.

(A. Spire, *Quelques Juifs*, Vol. I, p. 243)

"For man is not the work of a God who existed before the world began. It is man who has created his own gods in the image of his own dreams, and who casts them down when his dream changes, content if the new dream is sweeter and offers him a nobler

(A. Spire, *ibid.*, vol. I, p. 238)

The similarity between these two passages is so striking that one is justified in suggesting that Delpech drew his inspiration directly from Darmesteter; but whether he did or not, what does stand out is a marked identity of thought between a Jew and a Freemason who were both well-known personalities in their respective communities.

In his defence of Freemasonry, Mellor mocks the old, old story, according to which a Jew was at the origin of every heresy.

But it was Darmesteter who wrote the following passage, a truly terrible indictment, overflowing with centuries-old Jewish hatred towards Christianity, in which he stressed Israel's revolutionary role, published in an article entitled "*Coup d'oeil sur l'histoire du peuple juif*" (1880):

"The Jew championed reason against the mythical world of the spirit. It was with him that thought took refuge during the intellectual night of the Middle Ages. Provoked by the Church, which sought to persuade him, having in vain attempted to convert him by force, he undermined it by the irony and intelligence of his arguments, and he understood as nobody else did how to find the vulnerable points in its doctrine. He had at his disposal in this search, apart from the wisdom of the sacred scriptures, the redoubt-

able wisdom of the oppressed. He was the doctor of unbelief; all who were mentally in revolt came to him, either secretly or in broad daylight. He was at work in the vast laboratory of blasphemy under the great emperor Frederick and the princes of Swabia and Aragon. It was he who forged all that deadly arsenal of reasoning and irony which he bequeathed to the sceptics of the Renaissance and the libertines of the grand siècle (the reign of Louis XIV); Voltaire's sarcasm, for example, was nothing more than the resounding echo of a word murmured six centuries previously in the shadow of the ghetto, and even earlier (in the Counter-Evangelists of the first and second centuries) at the time of Celsus and Origen at the very cradle of the Christian religion."

(Quoted by A. Spire in *Quelques Juifs*, Vol. I, p. 233)

It would be easy to multiply comparisons of this kind from the copious Jewish and Masonic texts which have come to light. But to simplify our study, we will confine ourselves to the few examples from which we quote, and which in themselves sufficiently demonstrate the point we are trying to elucidate.

The relationship between Judaism and Freemasonry is most clearly summarised in the following article, which appeared in 1861 in a Parisian Jewish review, *La Virile Israelite*. Although over a century old, it is still applicable to the situation today, and we conclude this chapter by reproducing it in full.

"The connections are more intimate than one would imagine. Judaism should maintain a lively and profound sympathy for Freemasonry in general, and no matter concerning this powerful institution should be a question of indifference to it.

"For a very long time, owing to the progress in morals and public liberty, Freemasonry has been able to abandon its role of a mysterious secret society, forced by the fear and tyranny of former governments to veil itself in prudent obscurity. Its principles and methods have been known to the public for so long that it cannot be difficult to understand its spirit and its aims.

"But the spirit of Freemasonry is that of Judaism in its most fundamental beliefs; its ideas are Judaic, its language is Judaic, its very organisation, almost, is Judaic. Whenever I approach the sanctuary where the Masonic order accomplishes its works, I hear the name of Solomon ringing everywhere, and echoes of Israel. Those symbolic columns are the columns of that Temple where each day Hiram's workmen received their wages; they enshrine his revered name. The whole Masonic tradition takes me back to that great epoch when the Jewish monarch, fulfilling David's promises,

raised up to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, a religious monument worthy of the creator of Heaven and earth—a tradition symbolised by powerful images which have spread outside the limits of Palestine to the whole world, but which still bear the indelible imprint of their origin.

"That Temple which must be built, since the sanctuary in Jerusalem has perished, the secret edifice at which all Masons on earth labour with one mind, with a word of command and secret rallying-points—it is the moral sanctuary, the divine asylum wherein all men who have been reconciled will re-unite one day in holy and fraternal Agapes; it is the social order which shall no longer know fratricidal wars, nor castes, nor pariahs, and where the human race will recognise and proclaim anew its original oneness. That is the work on which every initiate pledges his devotion and undertakes to lay his stone, a sublime work which has been carried on for centuries."

(*La Verite Israelite*, vol. V, p. 74, 1861)

The oneness of the human race, the goal towards which Judaism and Freemasonry work hand-in-hand, "with a word of command and secret rallying-points", is the unification of the world under Jewish law.

"Let us now examine more closely the picture of the Messianic age, when justice and brotherhood shall reign over the earth, according to Deutero-Isaiah, whom it is well to remember is the most universal in tendency of the Prophets.

" 'What is certain,' writes Mr. Loeb, 'is that with or without the King-Messiah, the Jews will become the centre of humanity, with the Gentiles, after their conversion to God, grouped all around them. The unity of the human race will come about through religious unity. That is to say, if I understand the meaning of the words correctly, the Messianic age will be marked by the triumph of Jewish exclusiveness, in which the reign of justice means the strict observance of the law of Yahweh and his Prophets, the law of the poor; in a word, Jewish law. . . . '

"This is purely and simply imperialism, political, social and religious imperialism. To be quite sure, we have only to follow Isidore Loeb's guide to the description of messianic times in Deutero-Isaiah:

" 'The nations will gather to pay homage to the people of God; all the fortunes of the nations will pass to the Jewish people, they will march captive behind the Jewish people in chains and will prostrate themselves before them, their kings will bring up their sons, and their princesses will nurse their children. The Jews will

command the nations; they will summon peoples whom they do not even know, and peoples who do not know them will hasten to them. The riches of the sea and the wealth of nations will come to the Jews of their own right. Any people or kingdom who will not serve Israel will be destroyed. The chosen people will drink the milk of nations and suck the breasts of rulers; they will devour the wealth of the nations and cover themselves with their glory. The Jews will live in abundance and joy, their happiness will have no end, their hearts will rejoice, they will flourish like the grass. The Jews will be a race blessed by God, they will be the priests and ministers of God; the whole people will be a righteous people. The descendants of the Jews and their name will be eternal; the least among them will multiply a thousand-fold, and the most lowly will become a mighty nation. God will make an eternal covenant with them; he will reign anew over them, and their power over men will be such that, in a hallowed phrase, they will march in great strides over the high places of the earth. Nature herself will be transformed into a kind of earthly paradise; "it will be the golden age of the earth. For I, the Eternal One, love justice and hate plunder and iniquity; I shall faithfully give them their reward".'

"The dream of the poor, their ideal of justice, is no more humble, nor any less resplendent, than that of the Prophets. Yet there is a difference: the poor man is fiercer.

" 'It cannot be denied,' says Isidore Loeb, 'that the poor man goes too far in his hatred of the foe and in his thirst for revenge. At certain moments his anger becomes almost insensate, and he breaks out into curses which makes us shudder. He desires to do evil for evil to the foe with his own hands; he will declare war upon him and triumph over him; he will call upon the God of vengeance for help; his own eyes will witness the fall and punishment of the foe; he will mock his enemy, and his feet will trample in the blood of his foe. . . . '

"'Psalm CIX is nothing less than a long cry of hatred and vengeance against the foe.'"

(After quoting the text, Mr. Loeb adds: "It is a curse in all its horror.")

"As for the final result of the messianic revolution, it will always be the same: God will overthrow the nations and the kings and will cause Israel and her king to triumph; the nations will be converted to Judaism and will obey the Law or else they will be destroyed and the Jews will be the masters of the world.

"The Jews' international dream is to unite the world with the

Jewish law, under the direction and domination of the priestly people—a general form, I can but repeat it, of imperialism, which does not prevent Loeb, Darmesteter, Reinach or Lazare and so many others calling this conception universal fraternity."

(G. Batault: *Le Problème juif*, pp. 133-135)

SATANISM, NATURALISM AND FREEMASONRY

A NUMBER of the opponents of Freemasonry have linked the Order with Satanism and have attributed the doctrinal inspiration which animates the spiritual life of Freemasonry to supra-human origins, to a force of Evil.

Mellor strongly rebukes this point of view, and claims that it has been invented by the anti-masons.

"The Catholic faith accepts the existence of a Spirit of Evil and its intervention in human behaviour. The normal form of this intervention, temptation, is not the only one. It emerges from the Scriptures, and it is unanimously accepted by the Fathers, councils and theologians that in addition there exists a second, more tangible, kind of intervention, called diabolical possession. We have neither the competence nor the intention of examining it, and on this question we would refer the reader to the works of specialist theologians, particularly the well-known and rightly praised studies by Father J. de Tonquedec. Nevertheless we need this reminder in order to note how the antimasonic elucubrations on the Devil's account are merely the caricature of a genuine branch of theology. (A. Mellor: *Our Separated Brethren*, p. 255)

"Until the middle of the nineteenth century no one took it into his head to accuse Freemasons of being Luciferians or Satanists— not even writers like the Abbe Fiard, who saw the Devil all around; not even Barruel. Such an imputation would in any case have brought ridicule on their books.

"Let us bring counter-proof: it is well known that Luciferians and Satanists have existed ever since the Middle Ages.¹ It does not appear that they were ever recruited from among the Masons, and we should be hard put to it to quote from one serious docu-

The Luciferian is a worshipper of the fallen Archangel, considered as the source of Good; God, under the name of Adonai, is considered as the source of evil; in his view Lucifer was unjustly condemned. The complete Satanist, if he existed, would be a worshipper of Evil in itself.

ment dating from before the mid-nineteenth century having any pretensions to the contrary. . . .

"The idea that the Devil lurked among the higher degrees was very tempting to nervous minds, haunted with mediæval visions. Everything that we know about the higher degrees in the eighteenth century contradicts their theory. . . . (A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 256)

"In 1867, Mgr. de Scgur, the son of the good Countess nee Rostopchine, a prelate admirable for his spirit of charity and apostolate among the poor, started what was to be the long series of a whole inept literature....¹

"His book ran to nine editions in three months (30,000 copies), thirty-six editions in less than five years. He launched the legend, which was to prosper, of the 'inner lodges', where he stated that Black Masses were celebrated, and which the publisher, in his foreword, claimed had sentenced the author to death. . . .

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 257)

"In 1894 Dr. Bataille, a doctor with the shipping lines, whose real name was Hacks, published *Le Diable au XIX^e siècle*, an enormous quarto volume of close on one thousand pages. Many illustrations: nothing but devils everywhere. One of them—no doubt he wanted to see just how far the credulity of the public would stretch—depicted the *Quadrille maconnique*, *execute par les unties de l'Ordre des druides*. He reproached Taxil for his insufficient anti-Semitism!

"Taxil tricked even a respectable colonial bishop, Mgr. L. Meurin, Bishop of Port Louis (Mauritius). (A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 258)

"Mgr. Meurin was far from being an uncultivated man, and there is no doubting his good faith, but he did establish the most fantastic connections between the 'discoveries' which he thought he had made in the course of his reading. He was a frenzied interpreter, literally intoxicated by Taxil. . . .

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 259)

"This deluge of follies continued to pour down until the Second World War. Then came the Nazi occupation. Real atrocities made people forget verbal extravagances and the ferment of the imagination. The antimasonry of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was now dead.

¹ His doctrine was more uncertain. His *Jesus vivant en nous* was placed on the Index by an order of the Holy Office dated June 30, 1869. (The author submitted—Notes by A. Mellor.)

"In 1948 Jules Boucher published an excellent treatise on *Le Symbols maconnique*, in which, not uncharitably, he is content to say:

" 'It would be too easy to multiply the quotations from Catholic authors which evince gross antimasonic fanaticism. We shall not be so cruel.'

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 231)

"This nonsense, incidentally, has not yet disappeared in some regions, it would appear.

"According to a very reliable witness, the furniture of a lodge was being sold one day, and an old peasant woman came up, very curious, to the Master's chair, asking to see the slot where the Devil put his tail whenever he took his seat!

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 262)

". . . The old anti-Masonic school considered that Freemasonry consisted of Luciferian coteries guided by the Devil himself, and assisted by a strange general staff of Jews, occultists and radical politicians. Some had even got to the point of allowing that there were interconnections between these groups and spy circles."

(A. Mellor: *La Franc-Maçonnerie a l'Heure du Choix*, p. 414)

Finally, Mellor asserts that the Encyclicals have never linked Freemasonry with Satanism.

But, in spite of his claims, the Encyclicals, while they say nothing of Black Masses, do insist that Masonic doctrines are inspired by Satan, and one can hardly accuse Leo XIII and other modern Popes of being the victims of mental illnesses in the form of an obsessional psychosis—terms which Mellor is rather too ready to apply to people who defend traditional values.

Let us refer to the Encyclical *Humanum Genus*.

"After the human race, through the envious efforts of Satan," it begins, "had had the misfortune to turn away from God, who had created it and bestowed on it the supernatural life of grace and other heavenly gifts, it became divided into two distinct and mutually hostile camps. One of these steadily combats for truth and virtue, the other for all that is opposed to virtue and truth. The former is the Kingdom of God on earth, namely, the true Church of Jesus Christ, and all who wish to belong to it sincerely and in a manner worthy of salvation must serve God and His Only-Begotten Son with all the vigour of their minds and all the strength of their wills. The latter is the kingdom of Satan, under whose sway and in whose power are all those who, following the baneful example of their leader and of our first parents, refuse to

obey the divine and eternal law, and in many ways either show contempt for God or openly revolt against Him. ...

"From what we have already set forth, it is indisputably evident that their (the Freemasons') ultimate aim is to uproot completely the whole religious and political order of the world, which has been brought into existence by Christianity, and to replace it by another in harmony with their way of thinking. This will mean that the foundation and the laws of the new structure of society will be drawn from pure Naturalism. ...

"In this mad and wicked design, the implacable hatred and thirst for vengeance with which Satan is animated against Our Lord Jesus Christ becomes almost visible to our bodily eyes."

(ibid. pp. 1, 7, 14)

This Encyclical is dated 1884. In 1892, in a letter to the Italian people, Leo XIII returned to the subject.

"The war of which we speak is directed against both Heaven and Earth.

"But whence does it originate?

"It comes especially from that Masonic sect of which we spoke to you at length in the Encyclical *Humanum Genus*, on 20th April, 1884, and more recently, on 15th October, 1890, when we addressed the Bishops, clergy and people of Italy.

"They (the Freemasons) . . . conceived the Satanic idea of substituting Naturalism for Christianity.

"Let us remember that Christianity and Freemasonry are fundamentally incompatible, so much so that to adhere to the one is to cut oneself off from the other.

"The maxims of the Gospel cannot be reconciled with those of the Revolution; Christ cannot be reconciled with Belial, nor the Church of God with the Church that is Godless."

In a new Encyclical, promulgated on 19th March, 1902, Leo XIII returned again to the subject of Freemasonry:

"Freemasonry is the permanent personification of the Revolution; it constitutes a sort of society in reverse whose aim is to exercise an occult overlordship upon society as we know it, and whose whole *raison d'être* consists in waging war against God and His Church..."

On 20th February, 1959, the assembly of the Bishops of Argentina published a collective statement on Freemasonry, from which we have selected the opening paragraphs:

"In the course of its plenary reunion, the Argentinian Hierarchy, confronted by various articles published in the Press by Freemasonry, felt obliged to make a public declaration to the faithful, following the recommendation of Leo XIII to 'first of all, tear away the mask from Freemasonry and let it be seen as it really is. . . .'

"The Popes, the supreme and infallible mentors of civilisation, realising what a danger the sects represent to the world, have from the very first pointed it out, and unreservedly denounced this satanic conspiracy against humanity.

"From Clement XII, in his Encyclical *In Eminenti* of 1738, down to the present day, the Sovereign Pontiffs have repeatedly condemned the Masonic sects, and the Code of Canon Law, Canon 2,335, states: Those who join the Masonic sect or any other similar association . . . incur excommunication.

The doctrines and aims of Freemasonry were set out by Pope Leo XIII in these terms:

"The immortal Pontiff, Leo XIII in his Encyclical *Humanum Genus*, condemned Freemasonry in these terms: 'Alongside the Kingdom of God on earth, the true Church of Christ . . . there exists another kingdom, that of Satan, under whose sceptre are found all those who refuse to obey God's eternal law and who seek in a multitude of ways to act without reference to God or even directly against Him. . . .' The Pope warned us that: 'in our age all who favour the second of these two camps seem to have made an immense coalition, instigated and aided by a particular society, that of the Freemasons . . . they rival one another as to who can be the most insolent towards God's august Majesty. Publicly and openly they work for the destruction of Holy Church; their aim is, if it were possible, to rob the Christian nations of every one of those benefits which they owe to Our Saviour Jesus Christ'." (Verbe, August 1961)

Now let us allow Masonic texts to speak for themselves.

"Senator Goblet d'Aviella, of the Belgian Grand Orient, made the following remarks in a speech to the Loge des Amis Philanthropiques de Bruxelles on 5 th August, 1877 :

" 'Tell the neophytes that Masonry is not as foolish people imagine, a convivial get-together, a kind of helping-hand to one and all; it is not even a purely benevolent society, nor does it even understudy the role of our electoral associations. Tell them that if it does indeed aim to do good, it is good in the widest sense of the

word, and that if it does engage in politics, it does so to bear in mind questions of principle of which contemporary politics represent only a partial and secondary application. Tell them that Freemasonry is above all a school for the popularisation of knowledge and the perfecting of men's minds; it is a kind of laboratory in which the great ideas of the time combine to assert themselves, in order that they may spread through the outside world in a practical and tangible form. Tell them, in short, that we are the philosophers of Liberalism. Tell them all that, as far as Masonic secrecy permits. ...'

"Masonic progress is the kind of progress which takes a man obedient to God and to those claiming to be his representatives on earth, and makes of him a morally-emancipated freethinker.

"Camille Pelletan's father, a Deputy for Paris under the Second Empire, was speaking to the Legislature in 1867 in favour of people's Libraries and the freedom to read whatever one wished. He ended: Thus shall we bring to birth the final flowering of human progress—the man who is his own king and priest, answering only to his own will and conscience.'

"Words so completely revealing as these call for no comment; the only comment required is a comparison with what is certainly the most ancient Masonic text in the world.

"In the Bible, the book of Genesis, it is written (III, 1-5):

" 'Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

" 'And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.

" 'And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.'

"Mr. Pelletan said: 'Man is his own king and priest, answering only to his own will and conscience.'

"The serpent said: 'Man shall be as God, knowing good and evil.'

"Where is the difference?"

We have taken the above texts from a remarkable lecture on Freemasonry delivered in Paris in March, 1932, by Maitre Colmet Daage, a barrister of the Court of Appeal.

We shall now quote a text from Oswald Wirth which assumes special importance in this context. Oswald Wirth, a 33rd degree

initiate of the Grand Lodge of France, held an eminent position among Masons, having inspired a revival of spiritualism and symbolism in French Masonry, and being also the founder and editor of the review, *Le Symbolisme: Organe Mensuel d'Initiation a la Philosophie du Grand Art*. He was the author of many books on Freemasonry.

Marius Lepage, his disciple and successor as editor of *Le Symbolisme*, is the Worshipful Master of the Volnay Lodge at Laval, and it is in association with Lepage that Mellor and Father Riquet are leading the campaign in favour of closer relations between Catholicism and Masonry. Mellor praises Oswald Wirth very highly in his books:

"Secondly, rationalism had to face an attack from inside Masonry itself. This attack was a revival of symbolism. A man of noble mind, Oswald Wirth, whose reforming role we noted in our previous book, realised at the end of the nineteenth century that the anti-symbolists had led Masonry along the wrong path, and founded a group whose object was to restore and honour the study of Masonic symbols. . . .

"The Scottish lodge, Travail et Vrais Amis Fideles, became under the master's direction the heart of this renewal, and we can realise today that Wirth's work has been of immense influence. Without Wirth, the more intelligent members of the Grand Orient would no doubt have ended up resembling a society like the Rationalist Union, while the less intellectual members would have gravitated to various 'Freethinkers' associations.

(A. Mellor: *La Franc-Maçonnerie a l'Heure du Choix*, p. 148)

"Oswald Wirth's influence, however, was most effective in certain Grand Orient lodges which were isolated from the mainstream of rationalism. Oswald Wirth himself was indifferent on matters of the respective merits of lodges and the like. As we were able to emphasise in our previous book, the chief seat of this influence was the Volnay lodge at Laval, whose Worshipful Master was for many years Marius Lepage, spiritual son of Oswald Wirth and his successor as editor of *Le Symbolisme*. (He was to leave the Grand Orient in May, 1963)." (A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 151)

We shall now let Oswald Wirth speak for himself. In his book *L'Ideal Initiatique*, he explains to us the significance of a Masonic initiation:

"It is a serious matter to ask for Initiation, for one has to sign a pact. Agreed, there is no external, formal, visible signature; it cannot be compared with signing one's name in blood, for being

purely moral and immaterial, it demands that the man's soul be truly committed in the act. It is not, then, like driving a bargain with the Devil, in which the Evil One allows himself to be tricked; it is an agreement entered into seriously on both sides, and there is no escape from its clauses. The Initiates in fact are contracting certain duties towards the pupil thus admitted to their school, yet the pupil himself is by that very fact indissolubly bound to his masters...

(O. Wirth: *L'Idéal Initiatique*, p. 11)

". . . Note that the guides are never seen and do not thrust themselves forward. ...

"At the basis of any real initiation there are certain duties contracted. Beware then of knocking at the gate of the Temple, if you are not resolved to become a new man....

"It would all be nothing more than a snare and a delusion, if you could ask to be initiated free of all obligation, without paying with your very soul for your entry into brotherly communion with the builders of this great humanitarian edifice, whose design has been traced by the Great Architect of the Universe. ...

(O. Wirth, *ibid.*, p. 10)

"When the candidate, by his good name, has given proof of the moral integrity required, his first duty is one of discretion: he must undertake to keep silence in the presence of non-Masons, for, as an Initiate, he will be entrusted with secrets which should not be divulged....

"The minor mysteries met with in the Convents are in fact only symbols of much deeper secrets, which the Initiate will discover for himself as he follows the course of the Initiation. . . .

(O. Wirth, *ibid.*, p. 8)

"If the Hermetist's great work is not accomplished in us, then we languish for ever in the ranks of the profane and our dull lead will never change to shining gold. But is anyone so simple-minded as to expect such a miracle? The ceremonies of Initiation are only symbols. They are a visible and external sign of our internal acts of will, which are meant to transform our whole moral personality. If only our outside person is affected, then the whole operation has failed; lead remains lead, even though it appears to be gold from the outside....

(O. Wirth, *ibid.*, p. 12)

"When Freemasonry, or for that matter any other confraternity based on initiation, prides itself on its impenetrable veil of secrecy,

it is not a case of the transferable but of the intelligible content of the mysteries. One can divulge only the dead letter, not the spirit, which of its own accord reveals itself to those who are privileged to understand...

(O. Wirth, *ibid.*, p. 36)

"From all this there emerges a Masonic faith expressing itself in action and not tied to any one opinion. Masonry is the Church of Human Progress and whatever influence she has in the world is due to her undying convictions, which offer Masons a vision of a better, more enlightened, more brotherly future for Mankind....

(O. Wirth, *ibid.*, p. 56)

"Now the strength of Freemasonry lies in the collective will of its members. When they meet it is only to work, and since no energy is wasted, every lodge is a seed-bed of moral and social change.

"But do not ask the vast majority of Freemasons to give reasons for what they do. They act by instinct, following shadowy traditions which for centuries have exercised their suggestive influence.

"Nevertheless there does exist a Masonic doctrine, even if nowhere explicitly formulated in words, which is to Freemasonry what Christianity is to the Christian Churches; we may call it the science of Masonry....

"Now the Great Architect, no doubt because he is less trans-cendant than the God of the theologians, refers to an entity which does undeniably exist, for the constructive work of Freemasonry has, as its origin and inspiration, an ideal which gives birth to an immense energy. A force superior to themselves impels Masons and co-ordinates their efforts with an intelligence far exceeding that possessed by any one individual among them. Such is the hard fact which emerges and before which we bow our heads. Let every man interpret it as he pleases...."

(O. Wirth: *ibid.*, p. 58)

"In the book of Genesis, these ideas are expressed by the myth of the Earthly Paradise, a place of happiness in which primitive man had only to live, as do animals, or children who have not yet come to the age of reason.

"The beguiling serpent, who incites us to eat the fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, symbolises one particular instinct. He breaks away from the conservative instinct and represents both a nobler and a subtler impulse, whose purpose is to make man aware of his need to rise in the scale of beings.

"This secret spur is the promoter of all progress, and of all the conquests which enlarge the sphere of action both of individuals and of groups.

"That explains why the Serpent, inspiring disobedience, insubordination and revolt, was held accursed by the ancient theocracies, while at the same time he was honoured among the initiated, who considered that there could be nothing more sacred than those aspirations which lead us ever closer to the Gods, who are seen as rational powers, charged with bringing order out of chaos and with governing the world.

"The object of the ancient mysteries was to make men like unto gods. The mystery took on more of the divine nature as it rose morally and intellectually further and further beyond the level of common humanity. The programme of Initiation has not changed even in our own day; the modern Mason, too, also becomes more divine, but he realises that he can only become so if he works divinely, that is, by completing the unfulfilled task of creation. Raised above the level of man's animal nature, the Builder, by carrying out the divine plan, himself becomes a god, in the ancient sense of the word."

(O. Wirth: *Le Livre du Compagnon*, p. 74)

Oswald Wirth believed that man, by giving free rein to his noblest aspirations, is on the path to achieving his own divinity, without the help of any divine power outside himself.

This conception is at the opposite pole from Christianity. As G. Bord so clearly expresses it:

"From a Christian point of view, the Freemasons represent human pride, the spirit of evil, the revolt against God."

(G. Bord: *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France des origines a 1815*,
vol. I, p. 5)

Many similar texts can be found in French and European Masonry. This, for example, is what Dr. Raymond Corbin wrote in a book entitled *Symboles Initiatiques et Mysteres Chrétiens* (1929), which opens with a preface by the famous Freemason, Andre Lebey:

"Throughout all history, in India, in Egypt, in the mysteries of Pythagoras or Alexandria, the system of initiation has been constructed on reason; the Christian Church has only collected them together. The system which the initiates' own reason had built up in a symbolic but scientific fashion, through geometrical or numerical calculations, the Church has made into a mystery which she declares to be beyond our understanding; she forbids reason

even to try to explain it, and yet it is human reason's own creation or invention.

"To set a barrier on understanding, to cherish obscurity; these are vitally necessary for Christianity; how could she shelter her own authority behind that of a God, if she herself admitted that that God was only the work of a man?

"A symbol becomes a dead thing when congealed by the dogmas of a religion and turned into a Christian mystery, although it may sometimes have an imposing appearance, like a gigantic oak beneath whose bark there is no sap.

"The Church has everywhere sought to fashion a symbol into reality; the bread of the Eucharist, symbolising the fruits of the earth made to blossom by the sun, has become for her the very body of God; wine has become His blood; from the fulfilment of these two principles she has created a God in three Persons.

"These are formulas attributed by some philosopher to the symbols of initiation, and which have thus acquired a permanent character.

"Since they are final, and regarded as God's own revelation, all that they teach man is to submit without understanding; they compel him to shun any new interpretation, in other words, to shun all progress.

"One day, when humanity is more knowledgeable and more enlightened, it will look at these fables which the Church has made into dogmas, and these principles which the Church declares to be immutable, and it will find them too crude, too full of errors. On that day, the religions of the world will dissolve and disappear... ."

(Dr. R. Corbin: *Symboles Initiatiques et Mysteres Chretiens*,
pp. 102, 111)

Let us now turn to Masonry in the English-speaking world, said by Mellor to be regular and religious. We soon find that many of its best-known writers—Pike, Wilmhurst, Buck, Stewart, and others—say exactly the same thing, as the previous authorities from whom we have just quoted, and that the Vatican, therefore, has very serious reasons for making no basic distinction between the different rites or obediences of Masonry.

Here, for example, is what Thomas M. Stewart says in his book *Symbolic Teaching*; or, *Masonry and its Message*.

"Passing under a domination exclusively sacerdotal and traditional, and losing thereby the intuition of things spiritual (a gross, yet subtly presented distortion, on the part of Masonry which, while reducing everything to a purely naturalistic level of material-

ism, nevertheless claims to be spiritualising matter—author's note), the Church fell an easy prey to that which is the besetting sin of priesthoods, Idolatry; and in place of the simple, true, reasonable Gospel (to illustrate which, the history of Jesus has been expressly designed) fabricated the stupendous and irrational superstition which has usurped his name. Converted by the exaltation of the letter and the symbol, in place of the Spirit and the signification, into an idolatry every whit as gross as any that preceded it, Christianity has failed to redeem the world. Christianity has failed, that is, not because it was false, but because it has been falsified. And the falsification generally has consisted in removing the character described under the name of Jesus, from its true function as the portrait of that of which every man has in him the potentiality, and referring it exclusively to an imaginary order of being between whom and man there could be no possible relation, even were such a being himself possible."

(T. M. Stewart: Symbolic Teaching, p. 187)

We must return to primitive truth. Thus Masonry

"will lay the foundation for a grander civilisation that will secure social order, because it will be an organization of individuals actuated by a desire to do right under the Light furnished by untrammelled reason and conscience. Thus shall Justice be Universal and want and misery unknown."

(T. M. Stewart, *ibid.*, p. 12)

However, in its march towards the light, Masonry encounters a powerful enemy: the Catholic Church.

"Masonry is a world-wide institution; it teaches independent thinking, and is the only world-wide institution that stands in the way of the Politico-Ecclesiastical schemes of the Hierarchy at Rome; which is in the control of the Catholic Church, and dominates the good people of that Church who honestly and faithfully follow their misguided leaders.

(T. M. Stewart, *ibid.*, p. 58)

"Down through the ages two forces have been engaged in a deadly conflict, a conflict that concerns all the past, a conflict that enthralls the present with evil forebodings and which bodes no good to the future....

"The one force finds today its nucleus for a universal, undog-matic, and unfettered manifestation in our grand Masonic, worldwide institution.

"The other force finds its field of operation in an organised body

that seeks to maintain itself without regard to the largest measure of individual liberty and enlightenment.

"Upon one side stands an institution that has 'from time immemorial and through a succession of ages' given LIGHT to all its votaries.

"Upon the other is entrenched an organization that champions ignorance, superstition and fear, and that dominates and controls the reason and conscience of its communicants."

(T. M. Stewart, *ibid.*, p. 31)

This is what Buck says in his book, *The Genius of Freemasonry*:

"What our ancient brethren in the Greater Mysteries called 'the Immortal Gods', were simply perfected by this normal human evolution...

(J. D. Buck, *ibid.*, pp. 28-29)

"First a mollusk, then a fish, then a bird, then a mammal, then a man, then a Master, then a God.

(J. D. Buck, *ibid.*, p. 43)

"The theologians who have made such a caricature or fetish of Jesus, were ignorant of this normal, progressive, higher evolution of man. Hence, the theologian has created an impassable gulf between the man Jesus and the Christ; or between man and God.

(J. D. Buck, *ibid.*, p. 29)

"There has been a tendency, at certain times and in certain directions, to 'Christianize' certain Masonic degrees. Any sectarian or religious bias given to any degree in Masonry is wholly un-Masonic and wholly opposed to the real Genius of Freemasonry.

(J. D. Buck, *ibid.*, p. 34)

"The Mason everywhere is an enemy of Popery, because Popery seeks to deny, control, or abrogate every right of citizenship. It denies man's right to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. Masons are made out of Free men and not out of slaves. There are, and there can be no free men where Popery has control. This principle of Freedom lies at the back of Masonry, as it underlies the foundation of this government.

"It is necessary that the basis, the real Genius of these two Institutions, should be clearly understood and accurately distinguished; for they are exact opposites and are antagonistic to the last degree." (J. D. Buck, *ibid.*, p. 67)

W. L. Wilmshurst, who occupies an important position in English Freemasonry, expresses himself in more cautious terms than his

fellow Masons across the Atlantic, but his ideas are similar. He explains to us that Freemasonry is the revival of the ancient Gnosis, the notorious heresy which was a synthesis of the pagan theosophies, against which the early Fathers of the Church waged such a bitter struggle. (See W. L. Wilmshurst: *The Masonic Initiation*.)

It is very interesting in this context to bring forward the testimony, based on his own personal experience, of an ex-Freemason, the writer J. Marques-Riviere. He left Masonry following the scandals brought to light by the eruption of the Stavisky affair in France (see Chapter 10), and the bloody riots which ensued. He describes the life of the lodge, with its atmosphere of initiation, through which he had himself lived, in his various books.

"Freemasonry's resistance to the passage of time, and its survival through the vicissitudes of two centuries, are in fact a unique attraction in a body which claims no basis in Divine Revelation. A past of such length presupposes some permanent and unchanging body of doctrine underlying all the varied interpretations of successive generations of adepts.

"If this sect confined itself to party politics, one could leave it to the various parties to look after their interests in their own way. Yet behind all Masonry's feasting and postures, and even clowning, there is something else—something exceedingly formidable, which pulls the strings of all these puppets.

"There is a peculiar flavour, almost a bouquet, throughout Freemasonry. It is an atmosphere of silent foreboding, secret and esoteric ... a feeling of mystery pervades the sect, forming its attitude, nourishing all its spiritual life.

"Freemasonry speaks of initiations, of spirituality, of mysticism, of religion, of setting man free. Thus it enters, at least nominally, into the realm of Metaphysics. From long experience from within, I have learned that its chief object is a strange reversal of those traditional values which form the very essence of all spiritual life. I have obtained evidence at first hand of the existence of, not exactly a secret plot, but of a whole habit of thought which is anti-traditional, anti-spiritual and anti-Christian. I am the first to admit that this attitude of mind is unconscious, that it is not openly admitted or easily seen. I would agree that there is much good faith and good will in it, and that these qualities are sometimes very moving. But that is not enough.

"What we must flee (in Freemasonry) is a whole world, a whole doctrine, a whole way of thought, a whole hierarchy, a whole heretical Church. The dangers are great; the risks are fearful. I am not exaggerating if I speak of spiritual death.

"The Utopian idea of man's being sufficient to himself is a form of monstrous, superhuman, truly diabolical egoism. For such an idea to take shape under the collective, rational forms of the present age, one needs to suppose a supernatural origin in order to understand it at all. There is in all this ... a profound mystery of iniquity, a bitter and terrible spiritual revolt, known to few, but intoxicating many.

"This spirit, born of the Renaissance, dominated the lodges as established by Anderson, who was the spiritual successor of the anti-traditionalists. It reigned supreme over the corrupt society of the eighteenth century, and mastering the popular conscience, it provoked that hideous butchery, that riot of the unchained Beast, the Revolution of 1789. Rising Phoenix-like from its ashes, adopting a thousand different masks, it has ever since reigned supreme over western civilisation."

(J. Marques-Riviere: *La Trahison Spirituelle de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, pp. 103, 213, 224, 252)

For his part, a German writer, Baron von Stotzingen, has given us a clear summary of Masonry's essence—the worship of humanity.

"In the last analysis, the leaders of Freemasonry mean by this that man is his own master and that there exists no authority either below or above him. Expressed in another way, Humanism means the moral and spiritual autonomy of a mankind liberated from any superior authority; this is fundamental to all true Freemasonry.

"In this conception, of course, no place is left for a personal God outside this world. Nor can there be room for any form of stable government, resting on a divine basis. Carried to its extreme, this idea must end in total anarchy, and in the war of every man for himself against all his neighbours. For without a moral order resting on a divine basis, no legal, social or political form has any real foundation.

"It is true that in many countries Freemasonry does not draw the fundamental conclusions from its own basic principles. In any case, most Freemasons have no suspicion of what those conclusions would be. But this in no way affects the root of the problem.

"When the essence of Freemasonry is defined in this way, we can easily understand why it has such affinities with Liberalism. We can even say that Freemasonry is organised Liberalism, Liberalism's general staff. Nevertheless Liberalism confines itself to recognising the Humanist principle, but rejects its consequences. Socialism, the heir to Liberalism, is much more logical; it

unhesitatingly follows its own principles right through to their conclusion, and puts them into practice whenever it can.

"Not only does Masonry's Humanist principle lead to the Revolution; it actually is the Revolution. It expressed itself politically in the 'Rights of Man' in the French Revolution of 1789.

"The spiritual relationship which links Freemasonry with Liberalism and Socialism explains the apparently astonishing fact that the rich Freemason or Liberal is found, in spite of everything, in the same camp as the working-class Socialist—at war with the Conservative conception of the world.

"When we learn more of the profound essence of Masonry, we understand yet another of its relationships: that linking the lodges with the Jewish world. The modern Jew almost without exception, inclines towards a liberal view of the world, a view moving further and further away from any solid basis in positive religion . . . and in the writings of Jewish leaders today there recur the same phrases persistently employed by Freemasonry.

"So it is perfectly logical that at an early period Judaism should have turned towards Masonry, and thanks to its remarkable adaptability, it has gained increasing influence in Masonic circles. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that today most of the lodges are under Jewish influence and that they form Judaism's spiritual shock-troops.

"If we look again at the deepest essence of Masonic thought, we realise that the Humanist principle is basically nothing more than the ancient 'Non Serviam', which since the Fall has haunted the mind of man, in perpetual conflict with his better self."

(Freiherr von Stotzingen: *Die Freimaurerei und Ihre Weltanschauung*)

To conclude our study at this particular point, we shall show, from original texts, how similar conceptions unite Freemasonry, Judaism and Communism.

Here is the evidence of a Jewish writer of Hungarian origin, who has published very interesting works on Communism and anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia. Fetjo begins by showing us that Karl Marx declared war upon God.

"Before anything else, we must rid ourselves of this myth about God, Karl Marx tells us. I will never weary of repeating: God is the great evil. It is the ghost of God which prevents us from carrying through to the very end of our efforts to bring into existence that vision of which religion is only an abortive dream: the reign of justice and happiness, paradise upon earth.

"The number one exploiter, capitalist and robber of humanity is

God. He it is who is the foundation and moral source of every inequality and evil that exists. He is the great obstacle. Only if we socialise God can we socialise society and humanise man. No task is more important or more urgent, than to arouse man to rebellion against the illusion called God. This will be the revolution to end all revolutions, the last judgment which will unite the good and abase the wicked. As long as the ghost of God haunts the minds of men, there will be no happiness, no real joy, no peace, no tranquility. With Marx, war is declared against the ghost of God.

"It is the most radical of all programmes of revolt. God was in the beginning man's dream of power, perfection and security. Into this vision the poor puny creature put the very best of himself, his ideal, his glory, the fullest essence of his being. To be like God: that was the dream of Adam and Prometheus, a desire both secret and forbidden—forbidden because desired. To be like God: there lies salvation, Paradise, man's original impulse, the reaping of the harvest, the religion of pleasure and joy.

"How right was Adam in wishing to eat the apple! It was his right and his duty. Far from being blameworthy, his action prefigured the future action of humanity. The whole system of dialectics is contained in it. Would you forbid a poor man to gather dead wood? He will take live wood for his own. Who can prevent him? Who can prevent man, this 'fourth estate', who in himself is nothing, from desiring everything? Who can prevent us, we who are without rights, without property, from taking our pleasure, from reigning, governing, possessing? Only a conscience steeped in mysticism, that turning aside from man's first vision in alienation, the religious ideal which states that God exists but closes all access to God....

(F. Fejto: Dieu et son Juif, pp. 93, 134)

"Religion binds man, it ties him to his past, it paralyses him... To the devil with this teaching of resignation which 'deflects man from fighting for his own interests'. Salvation is not to be found in Heaven, nor in happy idleness: it lies in the future, here upon earth, in the fight for the future and for the earth. The true Gospel is not a message of humility. It says: man is fully grown; he is his own father. He has no more need of a mystical or any other kind of paternalism.

"Louis XIV said: 'I am the State'. But Marx cried: 'We are God....'

(F. Fejto, *ibid.*, p. 94)

"We the disinherited of all races, the proletariat, this chosen people. It is through the proletariat, and by ridding himself of

all feudal or bourgeois shackles, by shedding all mystical notions, that man will attain to God's stature, loving himself with a love that is infinite. He will expel the Philistines from Canaan, settle himself in the Promised Land, work in joy, feed according to his needs, and develop the forces of production; and having duly chastised the wicked and the landowners, and driven out feudalism, he will cause peace and justice to reign at last."

(F. Fejto, *ibid.*, p. 95)

Then he shows us the Jewish elements in Marx's ideas.

"Thus Communism, clothed afresh in scientific, dialectical disguise, revived the idea which haunted the Jews of old, that of concrete, material and immediate salvation here on earth.

"Marxism has been linked with German philosophy, with the English economists, and with Utopian ideas from France. But in Marx, at the very roots of his thinking, there is a certain 'pathos', a feeling of revolt whose 'judaic' character seems to me beyond question. Marx starts with an attack on religion, and with the most radical criticism of the works of God. He unhesitatingly 'unmasks' religion, and behind its images he found unbarred the pathetic spectacle of economic interests.

"God is an illusion. Religion (and here Marx is in perfect agreement with the anti-Christian Nietzsche) is a turning-aside, a deviation, proposing dubious comforts to the alienated man, instead of harnessing his energies.

"With Marx, a 'family quarrel' becomes general, even global. God is put on trial, in the name of all mankind; he is found wanting; all his attributes of omnipotence and omniscience are now taken over by man, the whole man, the new God, whose Church will be the Communist Party..." (F. Fejto, *ibid.*, pp. 134-135)

As we can see, these ideas very closely resemble those advanced in the authoritative studies on the nature of Freemasonry from which we have quoted above and in other chapters in the present work.

"The Jew is patient. He has been patient. . . .

"But patience has its limits. He has complained at last. He has complained to God against God. That is his everlasting suit. You will completely fail to understand the Jew, his torments and his exaltation, if you do not understand that his people are the plain tiffs. His is the people which stands up to claim its due, to denounce God for his injustice.

(F. Fejto, *ibid.*, p. 56)

"People at all costs want the world to believe that in this trial,

it is the Jew who is the defendant, whereas all the evidence suggests that it is the Jew who has taken the case to court. He is made to seem at a disadvantage, as the accused, whereas in fact it is he who is the plaintiff.

"For how many thousands of years has the chosen people been at odds with God? The Jews are the people who are angry with God, and for whom this family quarrel has become an obsession.

"You above any other are the jealous people. That is your truth and your falsehood, it is your curse. . . .

"In truth, the terms of the covenant clearly bear the mark of your own particular spirit. You it is who are jealous; you it is who demand of God that he shall have no dealings with other peoples, and that he repudiate all his other progeny.

"All or nothing was your motto, not his. Tyrannical children, you would have him all to yourselves. On the pretext of making him your only Lord, your only Master, your only King, you worked unceasingly to bring him down to your level, to dominate him, to make him the slave and instrument of your national expansion... (p. Fejto, *ibid.*, p. 106)

"Nothing could be less generous or more possessive than your love of God.

"To put it quite simply, you wanted to be like him, to substitute yourselves for him, to take his place. Nothing less than that!

"You are a jealous people. God is with you! And with you alone, solely for you, by your favour. . . .

"It is not a covenant between equals, it is slavery. It is not a contract, it is dictatorship. . . .

"And then there sprang up in your soul, from the depths of your collective conscience, that quarter where no man dares to venture once the night has fallen, this unutterable, monstrous dream, to make him disappear in one way or another and to substitute yourselves for him, to become like him, to be God.

"You didn't take long to transform yourselves from Adam to Cain and to kill Abel, the best among you, the one whose offering had been accepted.
(F. Fejto, *ibid.*, p. 109)

"And in that again is your sin. Our sin. It is the original sin, which you have made every effort to deny, to turn into a phantom, a myth, an illusion.

"No water on earth can slake our thirst. We are like a wounded beast running from one fountain to another in a fever, but always in vain. We are a gaping sore which never heals. We are a void crying to be filled, but which nothing will ever fill. For this

reason and for no other we have become eternal nomads. We cannot remain in one place. Our happiness is always elsewhere."

(F. Fejto, *ibid.*, p. 111)

One basic conclusion emerges from studying all these texts: the position is that we are confronted by a war of religion, a war whose spirit has been admirably described by the Jewish poet, Heinrich Heine, in his fascinating, terrifying and prophetic book, *Lutece*, published in 1843:

"The great mass of the public is still much concerned with the incessant war which the clergy continue to wage against the University. The dispute itself will not so soon be resolved, for it has roots in a centuries-old opposition, an opposition which we must perhaps see as the final and fundamental reason for all the unrest of French political life.

"The true meaning of these disputes is nothing more nor less than the ancient struggle between philosophy and religion, between the free exercise of reason and the belief in divine revelation, a struggle which simmered constantly in both the nobility and the bourgeoisie, and in which the rationalists gained the victory in the 1790's. Yes, quite often actors who survived the tragedy which overtook the French state and politicians, whose memories of the times are most vivid, quite often they have let slip in my hearing an admission that, when all was said and done, it was hatred of the Church which caused the French Revolution; and that the throne had been destroyed because it protected the altar. In these men's opinion, a constitutional monarchy could already have been established under Louis XVI, but it was feared that the orthodox King would not have been able to remain faithful to the new Constitution, out of pious scruples of conscience. They feared that his religious convictions were dearer to his heart than his own worldly interests, and so Louis XVI fell victim to this fear, this preoccupation, this suspicion. He was suspect in their eyes; that was his crime, and in those days of terror it was punishable by death.

"Although Napoleon had re-established and favoured the Church in France, his haughty, arrogant will was regarded as a sufficient guarantee that the clergy could never, in his time, advance too many pretensions, still less succeed in dominating the State. He kept as tight a grip on the clergy as on the rest of us, and the grenadiers who marched with rifles at the side of religious processions seemed not so much a guard of honour for the Church as her prison escort. The powerful, iron-sceptered Caesar wished to

reign alone, and everyone knew that he would not share his power even with Heaven itself. At the beginning of the Restoration there was more cause for anxiety, and the rationalists again felt secret shivers of fear. But Louis XVIII was a man without religious convictions, a wit who composed bad Latin verses and ate good *pate de foie gras*. The public were reassured. They knew that he would not risk his crown and head to win Heaven. The less he was respected as a man, the more they trusted him as King. His frivolity was itself a guarantee against even the suspicion that he might favour the black hereditary enemy of liberal France. Had he lived, the French might not have brought about another revolution. That happened only in the reign of Charles X, a king deserving of the highest respect as a man, and whom, everybody was already convinced, would sacrifice all worldly goods for the salvation of his soul. They knew that he would fight with knightly courage and to his last breath for the defence of the Church against Satan and the Gentile revolutionaries. They drove him from his throne precisely because they considered he was a man of nobility and integrity. So he was, just as Louis XVI had been; but in 1830, this suspicion was enough to send Charles X to his ruin, and it is also the real reason why his grandson has no future in France.

"It was lucky indeed for the July Monarchy that, by chance and the circumstance of the time it escaped this deadly suspicion..."

(H. Heine, *Lutece*, Paris 1855)

Heinrich Heine not only wrote lucidly, but showed great vision and insight where the Revolution was concerned. For Heine, famous throughout the world as the admirable and lovely poet of the *Intermezzo*, Heine was also a hate-crazed revolutionary and a fanatical Communist; this is what he tells us himself and loudly proclaims for all the world to read in his *Lutece*, a book which consists of a selection of articles originally published in the *Augsburg Gazette* between 1840 and 1843:

"I have not described the storm itself. I have described the great storm-clouds which bore the approaching tempest, advancing dark and menacing across the sky. I have made frequent and exact descriptions of those sinister legions, those titans buried underground, who lay in wait in the lowest ranks of society; I have hinted that they would arise from their obscurity when their hour was come. These shadowy creatures, these nameless monsters, to whom the future belongs, were then usually only looked down on through lorgnettes; from this angle they resembled fleas gone mad. But I have shown them in their greatness, in their true light, and

seen thus, they resemble if anything, the most fearsome crocodiles and gigantic dragons that have ever emerged from the foul abyss.

"Communism is the secret name of this tremendous adversary which the rule of the proletariat, with all that that implies, opposes to the existing bourgeois regime. It will be an appalling duel. How will it end? That is known to the gods and goddesses in whose hands lies the future. For our part, all we know is that, however little talked of at present, however miserable an existence it drags out in concealed attics on wretched beds of straw, Communism is nonetheless the dark hero, cast for an enormous if fleeting role in the modern tragedy, and awaiting only its cue to enter the stage.

"There is an approaching rumble of hard times filled with upheavals. Any prophet wishing to write a new Apocalypse will have to invent new monsters so frightful that the old symbolic beasts in St. John would appear in comparison no more than cooing turtle-doves and gracious cupids. The gods hide their faces out of compassion for the poor insignificant human creatures, their wards for centuries, but perhaps also out of fear for their own fate. The future smells of Russian knouts, of blood, of impiety and of violent blows. I advise our descendants to have good thick skins on them when they are born into this world.

"I made this statement, that the future belongs to the Communists, with a feeling of extreme horror and fear. Alas! It was no disguise. Only with fear and terror can I think of the age when those dark iconoclasts will come to power. With callous hands they will mercilessly smash all those marble images of beauty, so dear to my heart: they will shatter all those fantastic toys and trifles which poets used to love so well; they will destroy my laurel-woods and plant potatoes in their stead; the lilies of the valley, which toil not, neither do they spin, yet even Solomon in all his splendour was not arrayed like one of these—these they will uproot from the soil of society, unless they can take up spindle in hand and work. The same fate will befall the roses, those idlers beloved of the nightingale. The nightingales themselves, mere singers producing nothing will be hunted down. Alas ! My own Book of Songs will go to the grocer to make cones through which to pour coffee or snuff for the old women of the future. Alas! All this I can see, and I am filled with unutterable sadness when I think of the destruction with which my verses are threatened by this conquering proletariat; they too are doomed to perish with all the old Romantic world.

"And yet, I frankly admit that this same Communism, so hostile to all my interests and to everything I hold dear, exercises a fascination over my soul which I cannot gainsay. Two voices rise

up within my breast in its favour, two voices which will not be silent, though they are at bottom perhaps no more than temptations of the Devil—but whatever they are, they possess me and no power of exorcism can silence them.

"And I cry out: this old world society has for a long time been judged and found guilty. Let justice be done! Let it be destroyed, this old world in which innocence has perished, in which selfishness has prospered, in which man has exploited man. Let them be rent in twain from top to bottom, these whited sepulchres, homes of lies and iniquity. *Fiat justitia, pereat mundus.* . . ."

(H. Heine: *Lutece*, Paris 1855)

It was the same fanatical, revolutionary spirit that possessed Benes, when he proclaimed, on the eve of catastrophe: "Rather the Anschluss than the Hapsburgs."

In other words: rather invasion, and the ruin of my political ambitions; rather exile and death, rather the triumph of Hitler's Germany; anything rather than the restoration of a Catholic Monarchy in Austria.

And it was the same fanatical revolutionary spirit which filled Leon Blum, and which was so evident in a leading article which he wrote in *Paris-Soir* on 14th November, 1939—a newspaper which at that time had a circulation of over a million copies. Leon Blum was criticising the German-Russian agreement of August 1939 signed by Stalin and Ribbentrop, an agreement which hastened the Second World War, which was to prove so disastrous for Blum's own country, France.

He showed, clearly and rightly, that in August 1939, in the world situation as it then was, Stalin, like the god Janus in former times, was master of both peace and war.

By signing the Germano-Russian Pact with Ribbentrop, Stalin was automatically setting in motion the events which led to the Second World War, and this he realised beyond all possible doubt.

Leon Blum gave vent to his bitterness against Stalin, reproaching him for acting only in accordance with Russia's material and imperialistic interests.

"I say material interests, since I deliberately rule out of his plans any hint of that immense ambition for revolution in which lay the greatness of Communism twenty years ago. Stalin's interests are his personal desire for power and the interests of imperial Russia, just as they were conceived under the Czars."

This text reveals a great deal of the basis of Leon Blum's thinking. The Pact between Russia and Germany in August 1939 unleashed

the Second World War and led France into a fearful disaster. None of this matters to Leon Blum, the man who had twice been France's Prime Minister, for neither his country, nor his race, nor his traditions, nor his religion were at stake. Stalin's really serious crime, in the eyes of Leon Blum, thinking as a Jewish international revolutionary, was that he betrayed the spirit of world revolution. Exactly the same accusation was brought against him by Trotsky, and it led to his duel to the death with Stalin.

Trotsky, the cosmopolitan, messianic, Jewish figure-head, the demoniacal magus of world revolution, set against Stalin, the Asiatic, the man of steel, the cold, implacable agent of Soviet imperialism.

"Permanent revolution" versus "Socialism in one country".

The problem is thus a veritable war of religion; the greatest religious war of all time, for it covers the whole world, and there is not one single country on the face of the globe which can escape it.

REGULARITY AND IRREGULARITY IN MASONRY

THE school of thought in favour of reconciliation between Freemasonry and the Catholic Church constantly urges the idea of Masonic Regularity and Irregularity.

According to their tenets, and Mellor is of their persuasion, there is "Regular" Masonry, of which the Grand Lodge of England is the archetype, and "Irregular" Masonry, of which the Grand Orient of France, at the head of the Grand Orients of Europe and Latin America, is the archetype.

The question of Regularity and Irregularity in Masonry has been the subject of endless discussion between the different Masonic obediences.

What is it all about? Mellor gives us the following definition of Masonic Regularity:

"The term Regularity can be understood in two ways. There is regularity of origin and regularity of principles.

(A. Mellor: *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*, p. 61)

"Regular origin is where an obedience or, within an obedience, a lodge has been legally constituted and consecrated. The English rule is that a new Grand Lodge, to possess regular origin, must be founded by another Grand Lodge itself of regular origin, or by three other lodges of regular origin.

"Nevertheless, an obedience can become irregular. As soon as it repudiates one or several of the essential conditions of its Masonic nature, it becomes profane in the literal meaning of the word. It loses its Masonic quality. The example of this instance usually quoted is that of the Grand Orient of France, which by erasing the name of the Grand Architect of the Universe from its Constitutions in 1877, became in the eyes of all regular Freemasonry a pseudo-Masonry whose principal Landmark had been decapitated, a Masonry Masonic only in name.

"The regularity of principles is thus the juridical state created and preserved by conformity to the former. . . .

"There is one obedience whose regularity is not contested by any other, and that is the United Grand Lodge of England, sprung from the Grand Lodge of London, which was founded in 1717. This is the mother Grand Lodge of all others, the Mecca of Masonry.

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 64)

"Round this kernel cluster the obediences which are 'recognised' by the United Grand Lodge, or in other words, those that are regular according to its definition of the word. Thus, at least in principle, all these obediences recognise each other. It is this enormous bloc, united from the English point of view of regularity, although comprising lawful internal differences, which we will lump together under the heading of Regular Freemasonry.

"Outside this bloc, or to be more precise, outside this agglomeration of obediences, we find other Masonic powers which, since we are following the attitude of the Grand Lodge of England, for the sake of clarity we have grouped under the heading of the Irregular Freemasonries. The use of the plural is justified by reason of the profound differences between them.

"Finally, there is a branch of Freemasonry whose originality and particularity merits a heading on its own: the Scottish Rite. This rite is not an obedience in the administrative sense of the word, but rather a body of obediences following the Royal Art (Freemasonry) in their own fashion. One could almost say that it is an Order within the Order. The word 'rite' moreover, in this context, ought not to be considered synonymous with ritual, but as indicative, to be more exact, of a branch of Masonry.

"The idea of regularity would seem to be a difficult criterion in this instance. Can the Scottish Rite be included in regular Freemasonry? Yes, if one takes it on its historic merits. No, if one accepts the English criterion, for there are some 'Scottish' obediences which the Grand Lodge of England recognises, and others which it regards as irregular, such as the Grand Lodge of France. As an extra complication, the 'Scottish' obediences do not all recognise each other.

"A former Grand Master told me one day that the Scottish Rite was a 'great Power'. He was right.

"We do not wish to class the Scottish Rite with irregular Masonry, but since we cannot include it in the 'regular' bloc, which denies its regularity, we have chosen to describe the Scottish Rite as non-typical Freemasonry. Will this term shock some people? We cannot judge the question of Masonic truth. For that matter,

does such a thing as Masonic truth exist? Yes, it certainly does, from the English point of view, but what would be the reply of nine out of ten real Scotch Masons to this question?"

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 65)

As can be seen from the above, Mellor himself hesitates to assert the principle of Masonic regularity. Elsewhere, he adds:

"There is a universal Freemasonry, if by this term one understands not the organic but the spiritual entity of which the Order is composed (the English Craft).

"But, contrary to an all too prevalent error, Freemasonry is not — unlike the Church—subject to an administrative unity, even of a federal kind.

"If it knows no magistracy, this is precisely because it has no papacy.

"When one talks about the Masonic institution, that is only a manner of speech, for, historically, Freemasonry has not been instituted...

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 55)

"The different sovereign powers or bodies in Masonry are called obediences. The Grand Lodge of France or the Grand Orient, for example, are called obediences. From the eighteenth century onwards they have excommunicated each other in the most ecclesiastical manner. They have their heresies and their schisms. But that poses a problem, for the existence of heresy presupposes the existence of orthodoxy. If Masonry has no magistracy, where does Masonic orthodoxy reside?

"The Grand Lodge of England and those who have interpreted its attitude (the 'doctrine' as the jurists would say) have replied by stating that there exist in principle certain basic, traditional and immemorial assumptions, the Landmarks.

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 56)

"The list of landmarks has varied from one epoch to another, from one Masonic authority to another, from one author to another...

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 57)

"As we shall see later on, agreement on the Landmarks was never reached either between Masonic authorities or between authors depicting the 'doctrine'. In 1921, as a result of rapprochements begun in the First World War, the International Masonic Association was formed; twelve obediences joined it, and it published a declaration aiming at achieving doctrinal unity. . . .

"The agnostic inspiration of the Grand Orient of France was

visible in this document—there was no reference to the Grand Architect of the Universe. No criterion of regular origin.

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 58)

"The reaction of the Grand Lodge of England was inevitable, and on 4th September 1929 it sent an eight point memorandum to all the obediences in relation with it."

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 59)

This step marked a clear regression from the gnostic rationalism of Anderson in 1723, and a return to a diffuse form of Christianity.

"In 1938 Oswald Wirth published his resounding work, *Qui est regulier?* and in 1956, pushing latin logic to its extreme limits, a Mason as traditionalist as Marius Lepage, in his *L'Ordre et les Obediences*, challenged the very concept of regularity itself."

(A. Mellor, *ibid.*, p. 60)

The principle of regularity as maintained by the English is hotly disputed by the other Freemasons.

Here, on this subject, is the point of view of the Grand Orient of France as presented by Brother Corneloup, Grand Commander of Honour of the Grand College of Rites, in his book *Universalisme et Franc-Maçonnerie*, written in 1963 :

"The Grand Lodge of London and Westminster, founded in 1717, rapidly set about extending its jurisdiction. In 1726 its head proclaimed himself Grand Master of England; it swarmed to the continent, and especially to France, the home of numerous Stuart supporters and Orange diplomats, many of whom were Freemasons.

"The first French lodges seem to have been opened by them, at an uncertain date, but definitely before 1728. Once the example had been set, they were quickly copied.

"Originally the obedience was called the English Grand Lodge of France, but despite the descriptive adjective, which was not abolished until 1756, it behaved as if it was an independent power, and not a provincial Grand Lodge coming under the jurisdiction of London. The English were distinctly annoyed about it, as can be seen from the minutes of the Grand Lodge of England from 1734 onwards... .

"The bitterness clearly reveals that London considered that it was the mother Grand Lodge, and that all the others were subsidiaries whom it wanted to keep in its dependence, the sign of a strong desire to set up universality to its exclusive profit.

(J. Corneloup: *Universalisme et Franc-Maçonnerie*, p. 83)

"The conservative and conformist spirit—an intransigent form

of conformity, though ostensibly traditional—of the Old Masons is clearly visible in this attitude. The latter were to triumph, in 1813, in their struggle against the Moderns, when they bequeathed the same spirit to the United Grand Lodge of England.

"Two hundred years after this struggle broke out, we still find as lively a spirit of hostility, though couched in less truculent terms, on the part of the Grand Lodge of England with regard to French Masonry, apparently concentrated against the Grand Orient of France, but equally apparent against the Grand Lodge of France.

"The lodges had received accepted Masons from the beginning of the seventeenth century. With the rise of speculative Masonry, authority passed into the hands of accepted Masons, who rapidly took precedence over operative Masons; the latter found themselves outnumbered by a flood of new recruits, fewer and fewer of whom belonged to the 'craft'.

"The atmosphere in the lodges was entirely different; it became concerned with philosophical and sometimes even crypto-political preoccupations, disguised under a laudable spirit of tolerance, at least in theory...."

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 43)

However, within the interior even of English Freemasonry, agreement did not prevail over strife between Ancient and Modern. There was veiled but obstinate opposition to the Constitutions of Anderson, and to put an end to it a recast of the 1723 constitutions was envisaged.

"It was from 1734 onwards that it was decided to prepare a new edition of the Constitutions, perhaps in order to put an end to certain opposition. The need for it was all the more pressing after the affray with the Stewards (in 1735). The most severe criticisms, from both Catholic and Reformed ecclesiastics were directed against the total absence, in the 1723 obligations, of any regulations of a religious character and of all reference to traditional prayers.

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 47)

"All the modifications described below were introduced in answer to these criticisms. . . . And if it took four years to make the alterations, that was because hard bargaining was necessary, not only to obtain an assurance of appeasement from the 'clandestine' party, but also to appease the philosophers of the school of tolerance and universalism, who were hanging back in the face of an evident regression.

"The appearance, in 1738, of the second edition, set the seal upon the tacit agreement between the two parties.

"On 20th May, 1751, six lodges numbering seventy members

resolved to create a new Masonic body, and on 17th July the statutes of The Most Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons' were drawn up. On 5th December, 1753, the Society set itself up as a Grand Lodge, with Brother Turner as Grand Master...

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 48)

"In 1756 a third edition of the Constitutions of Anderson was published, from which all the amendments of 1738 had been deleted. How do you explain this return to the 1723 text if you reject my thesis?

"Henceforth, the rivalry between the two Grand Lodges became more acute and the argument took a violent turn, as I have indicated. The 'Ancients' were content to pin their loyalty and respect for religion on the 'Old Charges'; the 'Moderns' emphasised their philosophical, universal outlook... (J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 49)

"If, in place of 'Ancients and Moderns' one inserts, according to present-day terminology in the English-speaking world, the words 'Regular and Irregular', then these lines become as relevant today as when they were written, one hundred and seventy-one years ago. . . .

"The universality of the Ancients, and alas often also of Moderns, led astray by passion, is that of an ambitious sect rigidly entrenched in tradition.

"The seed of the universality of the Moderns is apparent in Article I of the Constitutions—a religious universality (in the etymological sense of the word) which tends to unite all Brethren of goodwill. But, just as we find today that the most intractable defenders of tolerance lack precisely this virtue when it thwarts them, so the Moderns forget their principles when they think that it is in their interest to do so. Thus George Payne, former Grand Master of the Moderns introduced the Bible into the lodge, prior to 1740, on the pretext that operative Masons should take their oath on this book. Such a decision limited the universality of Masonry to the followers of the Judeo-Christian religions, and contravened the spirit of universality....

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 50)

"However, the philosophical spirit continued to animate the first Grand Lodge of England during the second half of the eighteenth century and became even more clearly felt, as can be found by comparing the opening paragraphs of the historical account in the successive editions of the Constitutions.

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 51)

"The third edition is far more bold and precise. It is founded on a distinct philosophy of scientific rationalism. It proves that the leaders of the Moderns thought that the opinion of the circles from which they drew their new members had developed sufficiently to enable them to neglect henceforth the precautions they had taken in 1723. And the effrontery of those few words: 'Ourselves, with all the other animals.' Even today, that would be sufficient for the editors to be accused of materialism and atheism.

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 52)

"The fact is that we are confronted with two organisations, sprung from the same stock (operative Masonry), and palpably born at the same time and in the same country, but which have evolved differently because one developed in powerful middle-class, intellectual and aristocratic surroundings, and the other in a much more democratic climate.

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 55)

"The two Grand Lodges struggled together mercilessly for more than a century.

"However, they became reconciled to each other and prepared to unite. What catalyst effected this change of heart? My answer is: the fear of the French Revolution and its consequences.

"French Freemasonry did not have the active role in the preparation of the Revolution which certain writers have attributed to it. But the Freemasons did contribute to the expansion of the ideas which led to the collapse of the Old Regime.

"The English aristocrats, even the Masons, feared for their privileges. It is one thing to formulate philosophy in a lodge, but it is quite another to overturn the social order.

"When Napoleon Bonaparte became Emperor, the Sacred Union seemed more necessary than ever; his victories and the continental blockade shook Albion. It is from this era in England that the unwritten but real triple alliance dates, between the Monarchy, the Church of England and Freemasonry—an alliance which to this day has been very effective. It was in this climate that the Ancients and Moderns came together. . . .

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, pp. 56-57)

"On 23rd November, 1813, the two Grand Masters prepared and signed a treaty of Union, which was immediately presented to the two Grand Lodges, who ratified it on 1st December in the same year. The union was celebrated on December 27th, and the Duke of Sussex was elected Grand Master of the new obedience, which was called the United Grand Lodge of England.

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 13)

"The first and last phrases of the 1723 document are almost identical. But between the two, what an upheaval in the spirit of the text. Six words appeared in the Ahiman Rezon as well as in the Constitutions of Anderson: 'Leaving to each his own opinion'. Their suppression signified the rejection of liberty of conscience. In 1717 the word God was only used in the title; but it is repeated twice, once after another, in the 1815 text, and it is laid down that, under pain of exclusion, every Mason must believe in the Glorious Architect, and not only believe in him, but adore him, which means practising a religion. And the United Grand Lodge of England was later even to lay down that the God in whom one must believe is not the vaguely-defined God of certain spiritualist philosophies, but the personal God of a revealed religion.

"After that, the United Grand Lodge of England could go on and celebrate the universality of Freemasonry; it could even, priding itself on being the Mother Lodge from which all others have sprung, claim to put this universality into practice to its own profit, with the right to dominate the whole of Masonry. As far as we are concerned, it has become dogmatic and intolerant, and has fallen to the rank of the 'handmaiden of the Church', the obedient servant of the Church of England.

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, pp. 58-59)

"What is know as 'universality' assuredly has little in common with universalism."

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 59)

In 1921 a serious attempt was begun in Switzerland to unite all Freemasonry throughout the world with the creation of the International Masonic Association, which sprang from the Masonic Information Office, set up in Switzerland in 1901 by members of the Grand Lodge 'Alpina', which supported their endeavours.

"The twelve founder members were, in the order in which their delegates signed: the Grand Lodge of New York; the Grand Lodge of Vienna; the Grand Orient of Belgium; the Grand Lodge of Bulgaria; the Grand Lodge of Spain; the Grand Orient of France; the Grand Lodge of France; the Grand Orient of Italy; the Grand Orient of the Netherlands; the Grand Orient of Portugal; the Swiss Grand Lodge, 'Alpina'; and the Grand Orient of Turkey. In 1923, 38 Masonic obediences belonged to the International Masonic Association, with roughly half a million members.

"The United Grand Lodge of England did not take long to react against this step. As a result of its pressure, directly or indirectly, the Grand Lodge of New York and the Grand Orient of the Netherlands shortly withdrew their affiliation.

"In 1929, the United Grand Lodge of England took a step of capital importance by publishing its Fundamental Principles for the Recognition of Grand Lodges. It is obvious that this confirms and aggravates the dogmatism of 1815. Despite its affirmations, the United Grand Lodge of England has repudiated the spirit of 1723 and can no longer claim to be the continuation of Masonry as established by Anderson. Liberty of conscience is ignored. The Grand Architect of the Universe henceforth ceases to be a symbol; he is God, and uniquely God. Not just any God, but the God of a revealed religion, the personal God of Israel, Christianity or Islam. And the Bible becomes the first Great Light, to which all are bound, the Volume of the Sacred Law (V.S.L.).

"But it is not only the Mason's liberty of thought which is at stake. The independence of the obediences is also at issue. London claims the right to lay down Masonic law; the United Grand Lodge of England claims to dominate the Masonic world, to be the sovereign judge of the authenticity of the different Masonic powers, and to impose its law upon them. Confident in its powers of intimidation, which it has skilfully cultivated, and owing to the pusillanimous ignorance of the leaders of the different obediences, who are afraid of the least suggestion of a rupture, it arbitrarily fixes the criterions for regularity in such a way that it can always, in the last resort, make a decision according to its sole good pleasure.

"You just have to read the last condition, the most arbitrary. Who codified the landmarks, the customs and the usages? Of the landmarks alone, how many lists have been drawn up which do not agree, either as to the number or the text? Not even the experts agree among themselves. That is to say, if London has decided to delete such and such a Grand Lodge from its records, whatever the sacrifice the victim consents to, it will still be in vain, for out of the arsenal of the landmarks, customs and usages an argument will always be found to condemn it. (J. Cornoudou, *ibid.*, p. 80)

"But what is their aim, or rather, their dream?

"They want to make the Mother Grand Lodge the unique sovereign authority over the whole of Masonry throughout the world, in order to condemn every group suspected of being able to overshadow it, to qualify every independent obedience as irregular and schismatic, and above all, to destroy, or at the very least to isolate enemy number one: the Grand Orient of France, which for 190 years has been regarded as a dangerous rival."

(J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 128)

In conclusion, Coraeloup remarks:

"Let us not become hypnotised by tearing ourselves apart over such sterile, irritating and often insoluble issues, such as landmarks, regularity and recognition." (J. Corneloup, *ibid.*, p. 146)

Such is the point of view of the Grand Orient of France, which, we may say in resume, refuses to limit the principle of regularity to those branches of Masonry alone which accept the tutelage of the United Grand Lodge of England.

Brother Teder, from his real name Detre, who represents a particular branch of Freemasonry, Martinism, goes much further. He does not recognise the regularity of the United Grand Lodge of England, and only accepts as regular the ancient Freemasonry, which was Christian in inspiration. His point of view is set out in a little pamphlet, which was published in 1909, entitled: *L'irregularite du Grand Orient de France*. Although he only represents a chapel within Freemasonry, we have quoted the following pages from his work since he throws valuable light on the origins of modern Freemasonry:

"I have shown from authentic documents that, from its introduction into Europe by monks until the advent of the reign of James I of England, British Masonry was purely Roman Catholic, and that its Grand Masters, of whom I have provided the official list, were drawn exclusively from the Court, the Nobility or the Prelacy. . . .

"Despite the birth of the distinctive Masonry of William of Orange in 1694, the ancient British Masonry preserved its ancient statutes under the Protestant Kings and remained Roman Catholic; proof of this is to be found in the precious Masonic documents which I propose to publish, and which escaped the mad orgy of destruction at the hands of the innovators of modern Masonry in 1717.

"The war between France and England had just terminated. On 4th January, 1717, the two countries signed a treaty by virtue of which the Pretender, the son of James II, and his followers, were expelled from France, and the usurped Protestant succession to the throne of England was recognised by France. All this was carried out. . . .

"Then, one month after this treaty had been signed, according to the most creditable Masonic authors, four lodges from London detached themselves from the ancient British masonry and founded what was called the Grand Lodge of England.

"As the members of these lodges were obviously Masons and,

as such, had conformed to the ancient Statutes at their initiation, and sworn fidelity to God, the King and Holy Church, consequently by violating them they became perjured rebels, and by founding their own Grand Lodge, they precisely constituted in the eyes of ancient Masonry an irregular body of the first degree.

"I am not concerned with whether their reasons were just or not, nor with the right of any man, be he the Protestant sovereign, to found his own branch of Masonry, which is regular from his point of view, and irregular from everybody else's. I am also not concerned with the various acts of reconciliation which took place between the various Masonic bodies in England in 1813. I am only interested in the brutal fact of February 1717, which happened just one month after the Anglo-French treaty had been signed on 4th January.

"The next fact I want to note is in 1720, when all the Masonic documents that could be collected, the study of which would have enlightened the men who were going to enter the new Masonry, were burnt. Only in 1723, at the date when its Constitutions were published, did the Grand Lodge begin to keep a register of its deliberations, without saying why or how it came to be born.

"If one examines the 1723 Constitutions, one finds that they contain a history of Masonry, and the enumeration of the Ancient Duties and General Regulations, etc., of the 'Most Ancient and Honourable Fraternity', all, supposedly, 'drawn from its General Archives and faithful traditions of several centuries. . . .'

"Who is the author of this work? A Presbyterian clergyman, Doctor G. Anderson. But Gould, the historian of the Grand Lodge of England, tells us in his History of Freemasonry, that Anderson only became a Mason in 1721, that is to say, one year after the most valuable Masonic documents had been committed to the flames.

"Now, I suggest that it is an absolute fact, and I am in a position to prove my theory, that there are a multitude of misrepresentations or radical errors in Anderson's work which, moreover, the celebrated Lenning described as a rhapsody and an imposture. However, it goes without saying that the great work was accepted by the author's friends, or the people who constituted the Grand Lodge, and that what he had written became an article of faith before which all newcomers inclined, without seeking to discover the sources in which Anderson said he had delved.

"Where are the archives of which Anderson spoke? Nowhere, and he could not even have known those that, according to official

chroniclers, were burnt by some scrupulous brethren. As to the registers of the Grand Lodge of England, they do not begin until 1723.

"Between 1717 and 1723 are the six years comprising the real origin of 'modern' English Masonry, but in the 1723 Constitutions this period is passed over in silence.

"Since English Masonry existed long before 1717, where are the documents by virtue of which the four little London lodges, which apparently founded the so-called Grand Lodge of England, believed themselves entitled to do what they are said to have done? Nowhere. . .

"I am astonished that in a country where the Bible has been so closely criticised in order to discover its meaning, that nobody has yet conceived the idea of criticising Anderson's fables with a view to discovering the imposture relative to the true origin of the Grand Lodge of England. . . .

"A little further on I will refer again to Anderson, and then, relying on documentary evidence, I will prove that this man, who well before 1717 had been chaplain to the Masonic guilds of London, was simply a traitor to this ancient corporation, and that he used some of its papers....

"If they were burnt in 1720, there are others still in existence from which it is easy to throw a complete light on the obscure origins of the Grand Lodge of England. . . .

"That the origin of French Masonry is hidden from the profane amidst other things, that may be. But it should be hidden from Masons should only be allowed on condition that it is proved that these men, to whom the Light is promised, and who want to know whence they come and whither they are going, are only fit to be surrounded by darkness, and to serve as the blind and unconscious instruments of an occult power which they ought to ignore.

"Before 1717, an ancient Masonry, as I have said, undoubtedly existed in France, and it had to come to an agreement with the ancient Anglo-Scottish Masonry, introduced into our country by the Stuarts and their followers in 1688-90. To that branch of Masonry belonged all the illustrious Irish, Scottish and English who ardently defended the ancient dynasty and found death in 1708, 1715 and 1745-46, either on the battle-fields of England, or under the axe of Protestant Kings who protected the new brand of Masonry. Others were exiled to America.

"Thus it is clear that if ancient English Masonry could rightfully consider the modern English system of 1717 as irregular, we can say that the lodges founded in France by the Duke of Richmond,

which were regular in the eyes of the irregular Grand Lodge of London, were absolutely irregular from the point of view of the ancient Franco-Scottish Masonry. . . .

"In any event, the origin of modern French Masonry, as well as of modern English Masonry, stinks of irregularity."

(Brother Teder: *L'Irregularite du Grand Orient de France*, 1909)

Teder's thesis is similar to Rene Guenon's more recent ideas. This remarkable thinker and orientalist was a member of the Theba lodge as a young man; later he left Freemasonry, and towards the end of his life—he died in Cairo not long after the Second World War—he wrote articles in an anti-Masonic review, signing himself *The Sphinx*. He considered that the only valid form of Masonry, from the point of view of initiation, was the ancient journeyman's operative Masonry.

However, the really important factor in Masonry is not so much the historical circumstances of its origin, as its essence and the spirit which animates it.

Mellor and others would like us to believe that English Freemasonry, in their eyes the only regular form, is religious and non-political.

In reality, there was an ancient Catholic Masonry, about which little is known, and which gradually fell into abeyance.

During the eighteenth century, and under the influence of philosophical ideas, a profound evolution transformed what remained of the Masonic spirit and organisations. On top of this was grafted the struggle between the Scottish Catholic dynasty of the Stuarts and the Protestant Hanoverians.

The alliance of philosophical rationalism with the Protestant freedom of conscience gave birth to the new form of Masonry.

And behind all this stood a more ancient, profound and secret influence, that of the gnostics.

In 1717, it was decided at London to codify the statutes of the new Masonry. This work was given to two men: Desaguliers and Anderson. The former, Desaguliers, is regarded as an occultist, and Anderson as a libertine. In 1720 they held a vast auto-da-fe in the course of which they destroyed what remained of the ancient Masonic archives, and thus they were left with a clean field in which to create an entirely new constitution.

This was done and promulgated in 1723, and it is called the *Constitutions of Anderson*. It is the charter of the new Masonry, whence all the contemporary versions have issued, for the new Masonry has indeed sprung up throughout the whole world.

English Freemasonry described itself as the sole regular version and has always claimed to govern universal Masonry. In fact this claim has encountered two major difficulties:

- (1) Disagreement within the Grand Lodge of England itself.
- (2) The independent attitude of foreign Masonries, which considered that they had come of age, rejected the protection of the Grand Lodge of England, and, above all, evolved in a distinctly revolutionary and anti-religious sense.

The Grand Orient of France led this movement, followed, with some reserve, by the Grand Lodge of France, and became the guide of the Grand Orients of Europe and South America.

Freemasonry in the United States, while maintaining its union and friendly relations with the Grand Lodge of England, occupies an intermediary position between English Freemasonry and the Grand Orients of Europe. Some of its branches are nearer the English conception, and others the European.

The revolutionary and anti-Christian tendencies of Grand Orient Freemasonry, as well as of the Grand Lodge of France, are too well known for us to dwell on them here.

Let us, on the other hand, examine the differences which, despite an exterior appearance of calm, have continually agitated English Freemasonry.

English Freemasonry in 1723 was in no way Christian; it was rationalist, vaguely deistic and secretly gnostic. The latter source of inspiration is still active, but it has encountered the conservative, traditional spirit of England. Most English Freemasons were men who were scarcely concerned with philosophical or metaphysical preoccupations. The revolutionary and anti-Christian inspiration which constituted the essence of contemporary Freemasonry everywhere, encountered a veiled and instinctive resistance in English Masons. The pact which Freemasonry tacitly concluded with the Protestant monarchy, to fight against Catholicism, which it considered its principal enemy, contributed to restrain the revolutionary tendencies of English Freemasonry, whereas they developed freely in Europe and South America, and rather more timidly in the United States. In short, the revolutionary virus in Freemasonry is more or less inactive in England, where Freemasonry is more an excuse for social reunions than an organisation claiming to remake the world.

However, this does not prevent numerous English and American authors, such as Wilmshurst, Stewart, Buck, Pike and others, from whom we have quoted in the course of this book, and who are all high initiates, from writing learned studies on Freemasonry which are without exception anti-Christian and anti-traditional. They do not conceal their contempt for the conservative attitude of English

Masons, who completely fail to understand the real spirit of Freemasonry; they still provisionally tolerate the Protestant monarchies, but on condition that they are solely honorary without any real power, and they suggest, albeit in guarded language, that this situation will be changed at the first favourable moment. Thus Brother Carter of New York is correct in saying:

"When a society, such as Anglo-Saxon Masonry, admits into its ranks not only members of the multiple Protestant sects ... but also Unitarians, Jews, Mohammedans, and others, the followers of the various religions have some reason for considering that it is a rival in the true sense of the term, which if it does not for the moment supplant the other religions, at least tends to weaken them by reducing them all to the level of Deism pure and simple.

"I do not think that the new creed is very efficacious in this sense, for the majority of those who profess it do not take it seriously.

"If Anglo-Saxon Freemasonry took its beliefs seriously, little as they are, it would produce all the consequences which the opponents of the Order attribute to it."

(*Annales Maconniques Universelles*, December 1931, p. 252)

It is generally considered that Freemasonry and Protestantism co-exist happily, and that it is only Catholic intolerance which is responsible for drawing down on itself the hostility of Freemasonry, which is essentially tolerant by nature. But this is not always the case; far from it. On several occasions, in various countries, Protestant governments have forbidden Freemasonry, considering that a secret state within the state constituted a permanent source of danger.

But this is not all. On the religious and doctrinal level, theologians and writers of the various Protestant Churches have violently criticised Freemasonry. Mellor himself admits that in England, it was Protestants who first sounded the alarm against the rise of Freemasonry, well before Barruel and Clement XII. Again, in Germany it was Protestants such as Eckert who first drew attention to the sect. Recently in England, two Protestant clergymen, the Rev. Walton Hannah and the Rev. Penney Hunt, have published two very serious and well-documented books against Freemasonry. The Rev. Penney Hunt's arguments can be summed up in the following passages, which we have taken from his book:

"I am not attacking individual Masons. Many, perhaps most, enter the Society having not the remotest idea of the significance of its religious ritual. Many never trouble to understand it. They knew that leading ministers and Bishops belonged to it, and thus it

seemed absurd to suppose that there could be anything associated with the Order that would imperil one's loyalty to one's Church. So far from attacking such Masons, I would rather appeal to them to look at my evidence and to find out, ere it is too late, the kind of influence that is unconsciously working upon them with disastrous consequences to their Christian life.

(Rev. Penney Hunt: *The Menace of Freemasonry to the Christian Faith*,
5th edition, pp. 5-6)

"Freemasonry is simply Theosophy. It is the perpetuation of the worship of the old pagan gods of ancient Egypt, Greece, India . . . the contention is that God revealed himself ages ago, long before the Christian era, to the whole world; the various myths and legends of every race, including Christianity, are only local variations of the same revelation...

(Rev. Penney Hunt, *ibid.*, p. 8)

"In the Middle Ages, the old superstitions passed over into Europe. The Jewish Kabbalists were among the principal agents in spreading these things. And modern Masonry is the great conservator of this pagan religion.

(Rev. Penney Hunt, *ibid.*, pp. 42-43)

"In 1717 a wave of Deism was sweeping over England, and so Masonry reorganised itself and the Christian element was cut out. Any Masonic writer who pretends that Masonry can be harmonized with Christianity is violating the constitutions he has sworn to accept.

(Rev. Penney Hunt, *ibid.*, pp. 16-17)

"It is generally assumed that one of the chief recommendations of the Craft is the honour shown in every lodge to the Bible. The open Bible, on which are placed the Square and Compasses, is part of the essential equipment of every lodge. At least so the outsider is led to believe. But everything in the lodge is symbolical. A square does not mean a square. It symbolises something else. Similarly, if the Bible is there, it cannot mean the Bible. That would be taking things far too literally. Everything is symbolical. The Bible stands symbolically for anything anybody likes to think is inspired. . . . It is when we compare the contents of the Bible with the contents of Masonry that the contrast is so enormous that it is blasphemous to have the Bible in the lodge at all . . . there is no compatibility between the two conceptions. A man may hold the one or he may accept the other position, but only a mentality that is absolutely rotten with sophistry can pretend to hold both.

(Rev. Penney Hunt, *ibid.*, pp. 34-37)

"In his Meaning of Masonry (p. 146), Wilmshurst writes: 'A Master Mason is no longer an ordinary man, but a divinized man. God has become man, and man has become divinized.' It is said that there is a Christian interpretation of the Masonic ritual. Well, this is it.

(Rev. Penney Hunt, *ibid.*, p. 52)

"The future of Protestantism is in the balance. Is she so afraid of falling foul of a few official representatives that she prefers to allow her young men to be roped into this pagan religion? And does she realize that Masonic theology is more and more taking the place of the Gospel in the pulpit?"

(Rev. Penney Hunt, *ibid.*, p. 41)

After the publication of this book, the Methodist Church forbade its members to belong to Freemasonry.

And this is what the Rev. Walton Hannah has to say, in his book *Darkness Visible*:

"I am firmly convinced that for a Christian to pledge himself to a religious (or even, to avoid begging the question, to a quasi-religious) organization which offers prayers and worship to God which deliberately exclude the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in whose name only is salvation to be found, is apostatic. I am also quite aware that there are many Christians, and even Archbishops, who are also Masons who do not see it in that light, either because they do not take their ritual very seriously, or because they allow other considerations, such as the good works, the benevolence, and moral uprightness of the Craft, to outweigh the clearly pagan implications of its formulae.

(Rev. W. Hannah: *Darkness Visible*, pp. 18-19)

"Christianity is a faith revealed by God to man, and not a system worked out by man of ascent to God.

(Rev. Walton Hannah, *ibid.*, p. 41)

"Masonry is not so much a religion as a rival to the Church as a moral guide. But there is more in it than this. There are in the Masonic workings distinct elements of a religion in a far more supernatural sense of the word, a religion that is entirely non-Christian. (Rev. Walton Hannah, *ibid.*, p. 30)

"The great Masonic authority Albert Pike wrote: 'No man or body of men can make me accept as a sacred word (Jahbulon), as a symbol of the infinite and eternal Godhead, a mongrel word, in part composed of the name of an accursed and beastly heathen god,

whose name has been for more than two thousand years an appellation of the Devil.' The fact that Anglican bishops and clergy see no inconsistency in forming groups of three to recite this word almost as an incantation is really staggering.

(Rev. Walton Hannah, *ibid.*, p. 35)

"For the Christian who accepts the revelation, however, to revert to pre-Christian types and shadows for spiritual or moral light, and in so doing to ignore our Lord altogether and exclude all mention of Him in an unofficial and man-made system of worship and moral betterment is to dishonour the Incarnation by ignoring it and by going behind Christ's back.

(Rev. Walton Hannah, *ibid.*, p. 42)

"Most Masons do not take their ritual seriously, and certainly do not read the works of Ward, Wilmshurst or Waite. They would not understand them if they did (p. 30).... But although Masonry does in a sense represent religion at a pre-Christian level, it also claims to impart a light, spiritual and moral, which shines nowhere else. Furthermore, there are today two deadly enemies to the divine supernaturalism of the Church. One of them is humanism. The other is the increasing popularity of a pseudo-mystical occultism which finds expression in spiritualism, theosophy, and other less desirable manifestations. (Rev. Walton Hannah, *ibid.*, p. 45)

"Rome is remarkably well-informed about Regular Masonry. The plea that Rome has condemned English Masonry on false and mistaken grounds, then, is based either on ignorance or muddled thinking."

(Rev. Walton Hannah, *ibid.*, pp. 67, 69)

Walton Hannah then gives a list of the Protestant and other Churches which have condemned Freemasonry, and concludes with the remark that:

"The majority of Christians throughout the world have condemned Freemasonry as incompatible with the claims of Our Lord and Saviour. No Church that has seriously investigated the religious teachings and implications of Freemasonry has ever yet failed to condemn it."

(Rev. Walton Hannah, *ibid.*, p. 78)

Certain Lutheran and Presbyterian Churches have declared that Freemasonry is incompatible with Christianity, and have forbidden their members to join it, such as the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland (in 1927), and Ireland and America (at the Rochester

Assembly General, in 1942). Similarly, the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church in the Cape, South Africa, banned Freemasonry in 1942.

The Vatican has never yet accepted the theory that there are two different types of Freemasonry, the one regular, and more or less religious and non-political, and the other, irregular, revolutionary and anti-religious. The Pontifical condemnations have always specified all Freemasonry without distinction, and on 19th March, 1950, the Very Reverend M. Cordovani, speaking in the name of the Holy Office, laid specific emphasis on this fact. (see pp. 36-38).

To conclude, the theory of regularity and irregularity is simply not consistent with the facts, and is advanced for motives of political opportunism.

In practice, the Grand Lodge of England itself, guardian of Masonic regularity, has varied its own principles since 1723, and the Constitutions of Anderson have been recast several times, in 1738, 1784, 1813 and 1929.

In law, the theory of regularity is only applicable to revealed religion.

It would be justified if Freemasonry was a religion and if it was the guardian of a theology. In this case, the idea of regularity, far from being an argument in favour of rapprochement with the Catholic Church, would present an insurmountable obstacle.

Freemasonry has no apparent theology, but is there an occult theology? Is this even possible? This is the essence of the problem we have to resolve, and to which no solution has been found to date. It is a basic question, a matter of capital importance and of prodigious interest, for it lies at the root of all modern political thinking. No detective story could ever produce such a formidable and mysterious enigma.

OCCULT THEOLOGY AND GNOSTICISM

THE question we have to resolve is whether there is or can be such a thing as an occult theology secretly animating Freemasonry. For guidance in this baffling and intricate problem let us refer to the work of the celebrated Rabbi, Elie Benamozegh. In his *Israel et l'Humanite*, which is generally regarded as an outstanding contribution to contemporary Jewish thought, and which was re-published in 1961, under the auspices of Doctor Modiano, who is the President of the Representative Council of the Israelites of France, and the Grand Rabbi Toaff of Livourne—both very eminent personalities—Rabbi Benamozegh tells us:

"What is certain is that Masonic theology corresponds well enough to that of the Kabbala. . . ."

and the editors, Doctor Modiano and the Grand Rabbi Toaff, add in a footnote at the bottom of the page:

"To those who may be surprised by the use of such an expression, we would say that there is a Masonic theology in the sense that there exists in Freemasonry a secret, philosophic and religious doctrine, which was introduced by the Gnostic Rosicrucians at the time of their union with the Tree Masons in 1717. This secret doctrine, or gnosis, belongs exclusively to the High, or philosophic, degrees of Freemasonry."

(Rabbi E. Benamozegh: *Israel et l'Humanite*, p. 73)

We need hardly emphasise the importance of such an assertion, and of the personalities to whom we are indebted for this revelation.

This is what the Freemason, Wilmshurst, has to say in his book, *The Masonic Initiation*.

"Modern speculative Freemasonry had a beginning in the early years of the eighteenth century, but only in the sense that in 1717 originated that which afterwards developed into, and now subsists as, the English Masonic constitution. Masonry itself existed long before that time, and in two forms: exoterically, in the

operative building guilds, and esoterically, in a variety of communities of mystics and occultists, having no relation to the practical building trade but often using builders' terminology for symbolical purposes of their own.

(W. Wilmshurst, *ibid.*, pp. 183-184)

"All through the Christian centuries, behind the activities of public elementary religion and the official work of the Church, can be traced evidences of this higher, esoteric, more abstruse and difficult work of mystical Masonry.

(W. Wilmshurst, *ibid.*, p. 188)

"No one can read English or European history from the period of that memorandum onward (Henry VI) without realising that to that history there has been an inner side not cognised or treated of by academic historians, or without feeling behind the march of external events—and as it were connected with or even directing them—the concealed presence of minds more than normally capable, initiates possessing and wielding the very powers testified to in Henry VI's memorandum. The lives and literary remains of such men as, to name no others, Paracelsus, Abbot Tritheim, Basil Valentine, Jacob Boehme, George Johan Gichtel, Thomas Vaughan and Elias Ashmole, provide above-surface indications of a strong current of sub-surface activity, a current of which no record exists or is ever likely now to be made. But to that current one must look for the perpetuation of the secret Masonic science, and to its projection, in a highly diluted and elementary form, into publicity in modern speculative Masonry.

"The religious reformation of the fifteenth century was the first great episode in a far-reaching revolutionary movement in the intellectual, social and political life of the West, a movement the end of which is not yet. Amid the intensifying unspirituality and materialism of the times and the impending disintegration of public instituted religion, a decision seems to have been come to by some far-seeing enlightened minds to put forward the old mystical Gnosis and tradition in a simple form and to attempt to interest a small section of the public in it." (W. Wilmshurst, *ibid.*, pp. 190-191)

The American Freemason, Stewart, tells us:

"Students of Masonry soon learn that but little progress is made in its study from the historical standpoint. Why? Because the real secrets of Masonry are locked up in symbolism, and not in history."

(T. M. Stewart: *Masonry and its Message*, p. 50)

On 5th January, 1954, the Holy Office condemned a work drawn

up by the Grand Master of the Johannine rite of Austrian Freemasonry, (B. Scheichelbauer: *Die Johannis Freimaurerei*, 1953), and on 17th January the *Osservatore Romano*, the official Vatican journal, published a long article concerned with this particular branch of Masonry, from which we reproduce the following passage:

"Surprise may have been caused in certain quarters by this serious step taken by the Church, after the statements which have so insistently been circulated almost everywhere in recent years concerning the conciliatory attitude of the Johannine lodge of Austrian Freemasonry towards the Catholic Church.

"The plea was advanced, in this connection, that the excommunication decreed against members of Masonic sects by Canon 2,335 of the Canon Law, did not affect those who belonged to the aforesaid lodge.

"If there were any need for fresh proofs to confirm that the concepts of even the Johannine rite of Austrian Freemasonry are a positive perversion of religious principles, the above mentioned publication provided the most recent and the most irrefutable demonstration of that fact.

"The author is himself Grand Master of the Austrian Johannine lodge.

"We shall confine ourselves here to a summary examination of the principle ideas expressed in the book.

"It is there asserted that 'the direct aim of Freemasonry is to bring its own members to the "Gnosis" ', as being the only possible method of attaining the Divine Essence, and to overcome the existing contradiction between faith and science. Thus 'Gnosis' in nothing less than Anthroposophy, though this term is not expressly employed. Its principal dogma is Pantheism. Herein resides the 'Ars Regia', or sovereign skill, through which man acquires the knowledge of the identity of his own being with the divine being.

"It goes on to declare that Freemasonry favours tolerance in matters of dogma, seeing that no religious society, not even the Catholic Church, is in possession of the whole truth. Although there are to be found in all religions traces of natural religious knowledge, yet the 'Gnosis' is the only true science; other systems of knowledge represent only a preparation for the true science, that is to say, the 'Gnosis'.

"No one can fail to see the gravity of such ideas and concepts, and how radically and fundamentally they are not merely at variance with revealed religions but utterly opposed to it.

"Moreover, the placing of this book on the Index is an effective

warning to Catholics not to let themselves be deceived by those who are trying to persuade them into becoming attracted to Freemasonry by claiming that there is a change of attitude on its part towards the Catholic Church."

Now let us return to Masonic texts.

"'Masonry', says Albert Pike, in *Morals and Dogma*, 'is the descendant of that higher science held by the ancient teachers of those ancient religions that once illuminated the minds of men.'

"Considering the fact, that these ancient faiths taught a secret as well as an open doctrine, as did Christianity in its early day; we come to the mysteries handed down from generation to generation, in secret traditions; given to those ready to receive and to properly impart them. "This science was known as the Gnosis.

"The Gnostics derived their leading doctrines and ideas from Plato and Philo; the Zendavesta of the Persians; the Kabbalah of the Hebrews; and the sacred books of Egypt and India; and thus introduced in the early days of Christianity, that which formed a large part of the ancient teachings of the Orient."

(T. Stewart: *Masonry and its Message*, pp. 55-56)

and Wilmshurst for his part writes

"The Masonic system was devised three centuries ago, at a time of general unrest and change, as a preparatory infant-school in which once again the alphabet of a world-old Gnosis might be learned and an elementary acquaintance made with the science of human regeneration."

(W. Wilmshurst, *The Masonic Initiation*, p. 218)

T. M. Stewart puts it summarily when he says that once the world was illumined by the Gnosis. Then the Fathers of the Church, who worked unceasingly on the priests, persuaded these torturers to massacre the wise and fair Hypathia who was a High Initiate. Thus they succeeded in extinguishing the light, and plunged humanity into the obscurity of the dark Christian ages. But the Gnosis secretly lived on, and was transmitted in the dark, uninterrupted, by subterranean channels. Today, it has found new life in Freemasonry, and sets out to capture the world.

In 1945 a secret Masonic document entitled *La Massoneria* was published in Florence, Italy, for circulation only among the lodges, which confirms the true character of Freemasonry, and which clearly reveals that Catholics who defend the Order are unwise, to say the

least, in associating themselves with the strategy which it has elaborated for the profane world today. The following extracts are taken from this document:

"The Rose-Croix naturalist, John Theophilus Desaguliers, and James Anderson, a Protestant minister, and others, held a meeting on 24th June, 1717, in London, which was attended by the members of the four lodges which were active at that time.

"The aim of this reunion was to unite the Fraternity of the Free and Accepted Masons with the Alchemist Society of the Rose-Croix, so that the Rose-Croix could shelter their alchemistic research and their gnostic and rationalistic ideas behind the respectable facade of the Fraternity, and to procure for the Free and Accepted Masons the advantages which alone the rich, influential and ambitious adepts of the Rose-Croix could bring them, in view of the menace of certain decadence which threatened the ancient Fraternity.

"The Assembly unanimously accepted this union. Thus, on 24th June, 1717, out of this compromise, was born Freemasonry. And it was thus that there disappeared for ever the Fraternity of Builders, the Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons, and that Freemasonry, the workshop of pure Gnosticism, took up a stand against the Christian Church, the workshop of falsified and corrupted Gnosticism. (La Massoneria, p. 14)

". . . In 1723, Anderson drew up the Constitutions of the Free and Accepted Masons, and they were accepted.

"The appellation Free and Accepted, recalling the Church of Saint Paul, was retained in order to remove any suspicion as to the real aim of the infant Freemasonry, which has always been to work for the triumph of pure Gnosticism and liberal rationalism throughout the entire world.

"In order to give the impression that the new Masonry was simply the continuation of the Fraternity of the Free and Accepted Masons, the titles, the ceremonies and the details which Masonry had received from the Fraternity of Builders were rigorously respected. Only one modification was adopted: the degree of Master was constituted separately and was distinct from the Companion degree. Under the name of Apprentice, Companions and Masters, the army of pure Gnosticism set out to conquer the world.

"... The duty of the Knight Rose-Croix is to combat the bastard Gnosticism inherent in Catholicism, which blinds the eyes of faith, turns hope into a pedestal, and charity into egoism.

(ibid., p.69)

"Freemasonry alone possesses the true religion, which is Gnosticism. All the other religions, and especially Catholicism, have taken what is true in their doctrines from Freemasonry. They possess only absurd or false theories.

"The secret teaching of the supreme leaders of Freemasonry may be summed up in these words: to establish all the rights of Man... to claim for Man the possession of all these rights, the privation of which constitutes a usurpation against which all means of action are permissible. (ibid., p. 177)

"Freemasonry, which is simply a revolution in action, a permanent conspiracy against religious and political despotism, did not assume its symbols itself, as do the Princes and priests in Society. However, the Princes and priests, who were unable to overcome the Institution which is hostile to them, and which is so formidable in its organisation, endeavoured at various epochs ... to belong to Freemasonry and to introduce into it customs, formulas, titles and legends which would have warped the spirit of the Institution and which, instead of fostering liberal and democratic doctrines, would rather have encouraged religious or aristocratic tendencies.

"Confronted by these dangers, the leaders of Freemasonry closed up the ranks of the true Brethren, and in order to secure if not the protection, at least the tolerance of the powers of this world, they let them take part in the work in the lodges, only revealing what it was opportune to uncover. Thus, seeing that Freemasonry, so apparently insignificant, was turning itself into some sort of society entirely devoted to good works and charity, the powers of this world believed that in fact religion and politics were not connected with it. The paradoxical situation which this attitude produced serves as a protective veil under which Freemasonry can act every where in shadow and in secret, in order to attain its truly sublime ends."

(La Massoneria, Florence 1945)

The reader will appreciate that here it is a question of an ultra secret document, drawn up in exultation after the re-opening of the lodges at the end of the Second World War, and destined only to initiates of the high degrees of the Order.

Clear confirmation of its divulgations may be found in "Le Livre du compagnon", Part I of Oswald Wirth's book, *La Franc-Maçonnerie rendue intelligible a ses adeptes*. In the Chapter on the Gnosis, he says:

"Companion is synonymous with associate. One could not be a Companion without having been Companions at work, and with-

out constituting with them a collective unit from the psychical point of view. This collectivity reacts on the individual in such a way that the general light reflects in him to the degree in which he has shown himself capable of receiving it.

"Thus every real initiate enjoys an illumination which enables him to master the Gnosis, or the Knowledge characteristic of every person who has succeeded in penetrating the Mysteries of Initiation.

"One cannot over-emphasise this point: the alert Thinker can discern a supreme teaching which runs through all our symbolism. If we are able to grasp its most profound significance, our judgment will be illumined with a radiant clarity of understanding. It is then that, possessing the Gnosis, we will be able to claim that we know the meaning of the letter G."

Hence the vital necessity of secrecy to protect this work of occult interpretation.

"The Apprentice must have undertaken to keep silence in front of the profane, to submit to the laws of Freemasonry, and to love his brethren.

"The Companion is not content to renew his first obligation on these various points, for one has a right to demand more from an instructed Mason more than one could from a beginner.

"Thus the Companion has to redouble his discretion and to beware, in particular, of trying to explain to Apprentices things they would not understand. Each spirit must be left to evolve in its own way, without attempting to cut short the paths of understanding which the intellect must traverse.

"By reason of the fact that a secret is scrupulously kept, one is also assured of the advantages of fidelity from those in whom it has been entrusted. The Mason, who fails to keep his promised discretion automatically cuts himself off from the Order and renounces all the intellectual and moral benefits of the fraternity of initiation. Now the whole strength of the Companion lies in his participation in the soul of Freemasonry. Thus in him silence assumes a capital importance, all the more because he is called to act in the spirit of initiation, that is to say, in a veritable conspiracy of thought and will."

(O. Wirth: *La Franc-Maçonnerie rendue intelligible a ses adeptes*, pp. 56-58)

In his remarkable work *Les Societes Secretes et la Societe*, one of the most comprehensive and well-documented studies of Freemasonry that have ever been written, N. Deschamps cites an ancient Masonic

document dated 1535, the Charter of Cologne, which reveals that from this period there were anti-Christian influences, Gnostic in origin, which had secretly begun to penetrate Catholic Freemasonry. After a long period in the dark, they finally gained the upper hand in the eighteenth century. As Deschamps says:

"The birth and the development, in the bosom of Christian society, of secret societies such as Freemasonry, whose most fundamental idea is the negation of Christianity and of all social order constructed upon its principles, is one of the phenomena most worthy of the attention of the philosopher and historian."

(N. Deschamps: *Les Societes Secretes et la Societe*,
4th edition, 1881, vol. I, p. 281)

In the Middle Ages and at the time of the Renaissance,

"The Freemasons in Germany and Italy were overwhelmed with favours by the Sovereign Pontiffs, and there is not a trace of heresy or hostility against the Church in the Statutes of Strasbourg of 1462, or as revised in 1563.

"However, in 1535 we come across a document which reveals the existence of an order, under the name of Freemasons, whose anti-Christian principles are absolutely in harmony with those of modern Masonry. This time it is no longer a question of builders protecting their arts. How this secret association took the name of the Masonic Guilds is a problem which history has not yet resolved. We are suddenly confronted with an indisputable fact which throws the greatest light on events in this troubled period.

(N. Deschamps, *ibid.*, p. 317)

"The oldest and most authentic document of the Masonic lodges, known as the 'Charter of Cologne', dates back to the year 1535, and it reveals the existence, already going back some time, perhaps even two centuries, of one or several secret societies, which eked out a clandestine existence throughout the various States of Europe, in direct antagonism with the religious and civil principles that formed the bases of their constitutions.

"Through this antagonism and its universal character, this sect simulated a counterfeit character of the Church and her divine works—a posture which is the essence of works inspired by the Devil.

"Gradually, as one advances into modern times, Masonic documents become commonplace; the legends which run like threads through the rituals of the lodges, and which seem to refer to their different layers, demonstrate the successive filiation through which

the doctrines at the basis of Freemasonry passed before the eighteenth century.

"In its exterior organisation it resembled the great Guilds of Masons, which, like the Guilds of Mercers and Lombards for the merchants and bankers, united men skilled in the art of building throughout the various countries in Europe, owing to the large and prosperous community which Catholicism had created among all the members of the Christian republic.

"The legend of Hiram and of the Temple of Solomon is perhaps contemporary with these corporations. But beside it are others no less considerable, connected with the destruction of the famous order of the Knights Templar, whose voices are like a prolonged cry of vengeance against the ecclesiastical and civil powers whose duty it was to suppress the Order. Mingled with these memories and rites are other signs and ceremonies which take us back to the great heresies of the Middle Ages, the Albigensians, the Cathari, the Patareni, and their ancestors, the Manicheans and the Gnostics.

"Gnosticism, Manicheanism, the Albigensians and the Templars, these are the sources whence Freemasonry has sprung."

(N. Deschamps, *ibid.*, pp. 282-283)

While on this subject it is not inopportune to notice that Jewish influences were active among these heresies, as Deschamps remarks, quoting a passage from the renowned French historian, Michelet:

"The nobility of the South of France, says Michelet, which was hardly any different from the middle-class, was entirely composed of Jewish or Saracen children, people whose outlook was quite different from that of the ignorant and pious knights of the North. They were supported and greatly admired by the highland people, and they treated their priests just like peasants, dressing up their wives in consecrated vestments, beating the clerics and making them sing Mass in mockery. One of their pastimes was defiling and smashing images of Christ, breaking their legs and their arms. They were looked upon with favour by the princes precisely because of their impiety, which rendered them insensible to ecclesiastical censure. Impious as the modern world, and as wild as savages, they weighed cruelly on the country; robbing, holding people to ransom and cutting their throats at will, they waged a terrible war. Women in the highest society were as corrupt as their husbands or fathers, and the poems of the troubadours were simply amorous impieties.

"Finally, this Judea of France, as Languedoc has been called, not

only recalled the former by its bitumen and olive-groves; it also had its Sodom and Gomorrah, and it was to be feared lest the vengeance of the Church gave it its Dead Sea. Nobody will be surprised that oriental beliefs, Persian dualism, Manicheanism and Gnosticism should have penetrated this country. Every doctrine had taken root there, but Manicheanism, the most odious in the whole of Christendom, eclipsed all the others."

(Michelet: *Histoire de France*, vol. II, p. 404, quoted by N. Deschamps, *ibid.*, pp. 298-299)

Deschamps himself concludes on this subject:

"Before showing how sixteenth-century Freemasonry arose out of the ruins of the Order of the Knights Templar, we will demonstrate the identity of modern Freemasonry's doctrines with all these heresies, revealing the various forms which have shrouded the organised opposition to the work of Jesus Christ, or in other words, the Church of Satan, to call it by its true name, from the very beginning of the Christian era. Having been overcome several times by the faith of the Catholic peoples, the same enemy is mustering its forces behind the disorders of the great schism of the West, and the separation of the Christian world in two by Protestantism, and it is challenging the Church with a new struggle, universal in principle, and with the whole world as its stage, in which it masks itself in the form of a secret association. Gradually, as its success in the modern world increases its boldness, it is lifting this mask of its own accord."

(N. Deschamps, *ibid.*, p. 283)

The gnostic origin of Freemasonry is difficult to prove historically with absolute certitude, but Masonic methods of initiation are still completely identical with the Gnostics'.

This is what the Freemason S. Hutin says in his book *Les Gnostiques*:

"The gnoses do not have the appearance of new religions; they claim to possess esoteric knowledge of any given religious tradition, such as, for example, Judaism, Christianity or Islam. Most of the time, the Gnostics set up schools of initiation, 'mysteries', and conventicles jealously reserved to a privileged few; their proselytism is generally subtle and insinuating:

"They only disclose these mysteries to the initiate, writes Hippolytus of Rome, the historian of heresies, after they have given them a plausible appearance in their eyes: they only confide in

them when they have enslaved them and, holding them in a state of suspense for some time, they prepare them to blaspheme the true God, while they burn with curiosity to learn what has been promised them.

"Even when the Gnostic freely talks about it, his apparent proselytism veils a whole secret doctrine (written or oral), which is gradually communicated to the candidates as they mature, by progressive revelation. Gnostic esoteric knowledge applies much less to the doctrines (which are easy enough to pick up, after all), than to the practices of which they are the foundation—sacramental rites and rites of initiation, magic formulas, 'passwords' destined to open a free passage to illuminated souls when they ascend to the transcendent world.

"Many historians still consider that Gnosticism is a monument of weird and incoherent dreams and strange myths and fantasies bereft of any interest whatever to the philosopher, and that it is really nothing more than a particularly degenerate branch of the alarming attempt to reconcile contrary religious principles in the first and second centuries of the present era.

"If this point of view of the Fathers of the Church is still widely held, Gnosticism is regarded under quite a different light by contemporary 'occultists' and 'theosophists'. According to them, instead of perverse or raving heretics, we are dealing with men who possessed the art of amazing initiations, men who had been initiated into oriental mysteries and who held the key to occult knowledge unknown to mere mortals, and which had secretly been transmitted to rare 'masters'; Gnosis is total knowledge, incommensurably superior to faith and reason, and Gnosticism is derived from original, primeval wisdom, the source of the various particular religions.

(S. Rutin: *Les Gnostiques*, p. 5)

"The extreme diversity of Gnostic speculations cannot be denied. Yet it is easy to discover that an undeniable sort of 'family feeling' exists among the various forms of Gnosticism, despite the many differences and opposing principles which it displays.

(S. Hutin, *ibid.*, p. 6)

"If Gnosticism was simply a series of doctrinal errors in which certain Christian heretics indulged in the first three centuries of this era, its interest would be purely archeological. But it is much more than that. The Gnostic attitude was to re-appear spontaneously without any direct transmission, and this particular type of religiosity presents certain disturbing affinities even with the most 'modern' aspirations. The 'Gnosticism' as described by the heresi-

ographers constitutes the characteristic example of a religious ideology constantly tending to re-appear in Europe and the Mediterranean world at moments of great social and political stress." (S. Hutin, *ibid.*, p. 8)

The Gnostic heresy was very widespread throughout the Roman world in the first centuries of Christianity, and the Fathers of the Church relentlessly fought against it. It was an oriental theosophy of unorthodox Jewish origin, which once again brings us back to the many affinities which unite Freemasonry and Judaism.

In August-September, 1930, *Le Voile d'Isis* published a special issue devoted to Gnosticism, in which was reproduced an important article by one Michael Nicholas, first published in the *Nouvelle Revue de Theologie* at Strasburg in 1860. The author gives a clear exposition of the nature of the Gnosis, and brings out the Jewish influences which assisted in its diffusion:

"The first thing to notice is that those of the Apostles who had occasion to attack it regarded it, not as an error born in the bosom of the Church, but as a foreign philosophy which brought trouble upon the faithful by seeking to win them to itself and to turn them away from their faith. This is clearly evident from the way in which they speak about it.

"Elsewhere, he (St. Paul) expresses himself more clearly, he describes their system as Judaic myths, and he points out that the adherents of these erroneous ideas belong principally to the circumcision, or in other words, to the Jewish nation. This is cheap sophistry. It must be combated. Better still, they must be won to the Truth.

"There is thus every sign that here we are confronted with Theosophists who are not members of the Church, but who wish to act upon the Church and win her over to their doctrines— Theosophists who have found a few distant relations in the Christian faith with their own ideas and who, accommodating their language to Christian beliefs, claim to be the genuine interpreters of the Master's teaching. This is one of the most marked characteristics of Gnosticism. From its inception until the time when it had completely developed, it assimilated accepted doctrines everywhere, incorporating them into its own system and gathering, in the course of the long route it has traversed, Jewish dogma, Greek philosophy, Parseeism, Buddhism, and receiving in its Pantheon, Hermes, Saturn, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, and even Epicurus and Mazdak, (the founder of the fifth century sect advocating communal ownership of property and

women—author's note). One would say that this Theosophy aspires to universal spiritual domination, and that it seeks to substitute itself for all known systems, as their universal, legitimate heir, by absorbing them all into itself.

"They looked upon themselves as the depositaries of the doctrine of which Christianity, in their eyes, was only the popular and inaccurate form, and they considered that they were destined to accomplish the spiritual education of men whose eyes had not yet been opened, according to them, to anything more than imperfect clarity....

"This division, which is evident in all the Gnostic schools, could only tend to nothing less, as Neander remarks, than the establishment of an order of affairs similar to the mysteries of pagan antiquity. There was nothing more contrary to the spirit of the Christian religion, to the teaching of Jesus Christ, and to the preaching of the Apostles.

"Gnosticism has its roots in the Jewish sect; it was born among the Judeo-Samaritans, and it is in Palestine, and more particularly in Samaria, that its cradle must be sought. A flood of circumstances converge to prove it to us. It is first met with in Samaria, and it is there at least that it first appears with Simon the Magician, to whom it is ascribed. When subsequently it is found at work outside Palestine, it is in those places where the children of Israel abound, in Alexandria, in Asia-Minor, and in Syria. In the first decades of the Christian era it did not appeal to the pagans; it was only later, when it had been decidedly rejected by the Jews, and when it took on considerable proportions by borrowing large sections of doctrine from very different origins, and thus became a well-developed theosophical system, that it turned towards them, and even then it was to the Jews and Christians who had both, like itself, sprung from Judaism, that it appealed in preference."

(Article by Michael Nicholas in the *Nouvelle Revue de Theologie*, Strasbourg, 1860, and reproduced in *Le Voile d'Isis*, August-September 1930)

This theosophical attitude is common to all the branches of Freemasonry, and if there is one point on which the Vatican has never varied, it is that the Pontifical condemnations specify the whole of Freemasonry without any distinction of nationality, Rite or Obedience. The modern texts from which we quote below specifically confirm this point:

"Scottish rite Masonry falls under the condemnation decreed by the Church against Masonry in general, and there is no reason to

grant any discrimination in favour of this category of Masons", (1946); and a little later,

"Since nothing has happened to cause any change in the decisions of the Holy See on this question, the provisions of Canon Law remain in full force for every kind of Masonry whatsoever." (20th April, 1949.)

and finally, on 19th March, 1950, the Most Reverend Father Mario Cordovani, Master of the Sacred Palace, wrote an article entitled "The Church and Freemasonry", which was published in the *Osservatore Romano*, and from which we have selected the following passages:

"Among the things which are springing up again with renewed vigour, and not only in Italy, is Freemasonry with its ever recurring hostility to religion and to the Church. One only needs to recall the speeches delivered in Parliament by the head of Italian Freemasonry.

"What appears to be a new feature in this Masonic renaissance is the rumour circulating in various social classes that a particular rite of Masonry might no longer be in opposition to the Church, whereby even Catholics can enrol at their ease in the sect without fear of excommunication and reproach. Those responsible for propagating these rumours must surely know that nothing has been modified in the Church's teaching relative to Freemasonry, and if they continue this campaign it can only be in order to profit from the naivety of simple folk.

"The Bishops know that Canon 684, and especially Canon 2,335, which excommunicates those who have given their names to Masonry without any distinction between rites, are as full in force today as they always have been; all Catholics ought to know this and to remember it, so as not to fall into this snare, and also so as to know how to pass due judgment on the fact that certain simpletons believe that they can call themselves both Catholics and Freemasons with impunity. This, I repeat, applies to all Masonic rites, even if some of them, in varying circumstances, declare that they are not hostile to the Church.

"But does not this rigid attitude disregard the good will of some people who would like ecclesiastical authority to recognise some small sector of Freemasonry said not to be hostile to religion and to the Church? And is it not equally opposed to the spirit of accommodation which the Church has shown in every epoch, out-

stripping everyone in a spirit of comprehension and generous charity?

"Only a frivolous-minded person could say that. . . .

"This modern tendency, manifest among those who would gladly bring Catholicism into harmony with all ideologies and social movements, with every advance and about-turn—is not this a sign of heresy, even if among many it is unconsciously present?"

(Article by the Most Rev. Father Cordovani, in the *Osservatore Romano*, 19th March, 1950)

Arthur Preuss, who was a Catholic, concluded a remarkable study on American Freemasonry with this paragraph:

"Masonry is one throughout, but not by virtue of the rite, which is only an accidental unity, nor by virtue of its jurisdiction, which similarly is simply a matter of conscience, nor by virtue of its exoteric members, for they are maintained in ignorance of the Art. Masonry is one in its real, esoteric spirit; it is one in its aim and its object; it is one in its light and its doctrines, one in its philosophy and its religion; and in this way it forms a family, a corporation, an institution, a fraternity, an order, a world, which tends by its universality to substitute itself for the Catholicism which was established by Christ."

(A. Preuss: *Etude sur la Franc-Maçonnerie Americaine*, p. 302, from the authorised Fr. tr. by Mgr. Jouin, from the 2nd American edition, 1908)

For his part, and with all manner of oratical precautions, the Freemason G. Vinatrel tells us in his book *Communisme et Franc-Maçonnerie*, which was published in 1961:

"One talks of 'Freemasonry'. Freemasons among themselves talk of 'Obediences' and also of 'The Order'. Thus they recognise that there are several Freemasonries throughout the world, but that the Masonic spirit is one.

"The Obediences spring from various sources of inspiration. Certain of them, under the influence of the Grand Lodge of England, are deist. The belief in a principal creator, the Grand Architect of the Universe, is accompanied by faith in the revealed truth, such as may be found in the Bible and various other sacred books (the Koran, the Vedas, and others). In fact it is the Protestant spirit, in the diversity of its beliefs and the unity of its faith, which predominates. These Obediences have a supplementary motive for considering Communism as opposed to Freemasonry. Along with the Catholic Church, they condemn atheism.

"Certain Latin American and European Obediences, notably the Grand Orient of France, the Grand Orient of Belgium, and others, are rationalist in inspiration.

"They do not compel their members to believe in the Grand Architect of the Universe, which they are content to acknowledge as an indeterminate symbol, an unknown guardian power. They do not consider that the Bible bears the specific stamp of Revelation. To them it is simply one sacred book, among many others, attesting to the wisdom of men and to Tradition, without attempting to discover what it represents or what lies hid in its pages.

"The Grand Orient of France, contrary to what is generally believed, has not banned the Bible from its altars, or the Grand Architect of the Universe from its lodges. Its members are free to invoke him or not, according to the rite which they have chosen (French Rite, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, etc.).

"This diversity, however, is no obstacle to the profound unity of Masonic thought. All Freemasons throughout the world demand Tolerance for the ideas of others.

"All Freemasons adopt the celebrated motto which was bequeathed by the Grand Orient to the Great French Revolution: 'Liberty, Fraternity, Equality'. This slogan has raised up the peoples. In turn it was adopted by Latin America and then by revolutionary China. The Russian Revolution in February 1917 spoke the same language."

(G. Vinatrel: *Communisme et Franc-Maçonnerie*, p. 78)

How can it possibly be doubted? How can it conceivably be imagined that Freemasonry could have subsisted, unless it is held together by a supple but firm bond of unity, under a leadership from above which is highly efficacious and absolutely occult?

FREEMASONRY AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1789

A WHOLE school, of which Mellor is a supporter, maintains that Freemasonry played no part in the preparation and development of the French Revolution in 1789. This is what Mellor says on the subject:

"Partisan history generally sees in eighteenth century Freemasonry the mother of the French Revolution. The legend did not originate in the lodges, far from it. The Revolution forced the lodges to lie low and guillotined the Freemasons. . . . The real reason for which it boasts this accomplishment is that Barruel, an emigre Jesuit, made it the theme of his *Memoirs* illustrating the History of Jacobinism, published in London in 1797."

(A. Mellor: *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*, p. 22)

"Barruel can be considered as the father of modern antimasonry. The brand which had existed before him was short-lived. On the other hand, his sowed the seeds of lasting hatred; and of all those who wrote against Masonry, it was he who did it most harm. By accrediting the idea—shown now to be historically false—that the Revolution was the daughter of Freemasonry he was blindly believed by all and sundry. The opponents of Masonry based their dogma on the famous theory of the alleged conspiracy, and the Masons gloried in a revolution which not only had they neither prepared nor waged, but which had guillotined the best among them and closed the lodges. To compare Barruel with Pascal would of course be absurd, but it is possible to compare the blow which he dealt to Freemasonry with the blow which the *Lettres Provinciales* dealt to the Society of Jesus. He caused his adversary immense harm, and it can even be said that it has never fully recovered from it. He was the fountain-head for generations of anti-masons."

(A. Mellor: *Our Separated Brethren—the Freemasons*, pp. 249-250)

For his part, Roger Priouret has recently devoted a whole book called *La Franc-Maçonnerie sous les lys* (Grasset, 1953) to absolving Freemasonry of any responsibility for the Revolution of 1789.

Other historians, whose testimony is more numerous and valuable, support the opposite argument. Among these, we must mention principally the remarkable works of Augustin Cochin and Gustave Bord.

Apart from the case of Barruel, the pet aversion of Mellor and progressives, to which we will return in another chapter, two Catholic writers, Gustave Bord and Augustin Cochin, whose importance no-one disputes—indeed it is recognised by the Freemasons themselves—have made extensive investigations into the position of Freemasonry in 1789. Similarly, a writer who was himself a member of Grand Orient Freemasonry, Gaston Martin, has published a highly documented historical study on this subject, and his conclusions agree with those of Gustave Bord and Augustin Cochin. The only difference is that Martin extols the work of the French Revolution, whereas the latter protest against it, but they are in almost complete agreement regarding the important role played by Freemasonry in this great tragedy. Furthermore, all three authors refer us to their sources, which is something that Mellor never does.

Now, it is interesting to note that one will search in vain in Mellor's works for any mention of these three authors; the name of Augustin Cochin does not appear and those of Gustave Bord and Gaston Martin are only mentioned in passing, without any reference to their works. The reader who only has Mellor's books to hand would remain totally unaware of the name of Augustin Cochin and would only know of the existence of the other two without knowing anything about what they have written. The same is true of another contemporary author, Bernard Fay.

Nevertheless, in accordance with our method of inquiry, we will summon as the principal witness on this question the evidence of a Masonic writer, the historian Gaston Martin, a member of the Grand Orient of France. For, regarding the role of Freemasonry in the preparation of the French Revolution, his remarkable work, for which he won the Arthur Mille prize of 4000 francs, provides us with clear and plentiful documentation. Gaston Martin accuses all the opponents of Freemasonry of bad faith; which cuts short all discussion. He says:

"Freemasonry is not subversive, it respects the king, religion and the law", "but it may be wise to add that this obedience

objects to passivity. Laws are worthy of respect, but they are not untouchable."

(G. Martin: *La Franc-Maçonnerie Française et la Révolution*, p. 43)

Enlightened souls, Masons await the opportunity to modify the laws and, in fact, propagate principles that destroy them.

All this is thus a verbal dispute.

Freemasonry proclaims and spreads a new system of political, social and religious ideas; these ideas constitute a different civilisation, radically hostile to the old; for Freemasons it is, by definition, superior, and Freemasonry is constantly seeking to build it up. We believe, on the contrary, that it is evil and dangerous, and, since to establish this new civilisation it is first necessary to destroy the old one, we are therefore compelled to say that Freemasonry is destructive.

Gaston Martin investigates the role of French Freemasonry in the preparation of the Revolution.

It consists of three phases:

- (1) The elaboration of revolutionary doctrine.
- (2) The propagation of the doctrine.
- (3) The active participation of Freemasonry in the Revolution.

Let us first examine the way in which revolutionary doctrine was elaborated. The close link between the Freemasons and the French Encyclopaedists is now known to us. Did Freemasonry inspire the philosophers or did it borrow its doctrines from them?

The Freemason Amiable (quoted by G. Martin) supports the first theory, Gaston Martin the second. This point is therefore not clearly elucidated.

The philosophers had worked out an abstract doctrine. From 1773 to 1788 Freemasonry brought these doctrines into focus and made their practical application possible; a work which Martin summarizes thus:

"In this way there emerged little by little the doctrine which was to become that of the States-General. The Masons of Saint-Brieuc were right in saying that it was all in the philosophers; those of Rennes were not wrong in stating that it was nevertheless Masonry which made it the instrument of political and social emancipation that it was in process of becoming."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 97)

For this doctrine to have a practical political application, two conditions were necessary:

"Firstly, the support of the majority of the nation for its demands.

"And, secondly, a sufficient force to surmount the impediments which would not fail to come from those whose interests it would injure.

"Masonry worked successfully in support of these two conditions.

"It campaigned to secure the support of the majority of the nation, to secure a force (through which to act) it took an active hand in elections; at the same time it strove to disarm the hostility of rival forces."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 98)

The campaign was initiated in Masonic circles, with the following result:

"The fundamental principles of Masonry ended by becoming part and parcel of the mentality of all Masons; they were no more just an acquired philosophical idea, but became a way of feeling, often also a way of being."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 120)

The foundation of the Grand Orient in 1773 and the re-organisation of the Nine Sisters Lodge (of which Voltaire was a member) marked the beginning of a new phase: the campaign outside the lodges.

"The methods of propaganda used by Freemasons to spread abroad the reforming truths they wanted to diffuse in the outside world can be divided into three categories: the Press, propaganda by word of mouth, and the instructive spirit of the club."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 126)

The balance-sheet of Masonic action in the field of ideas thus established that:

"1. Masonry was the best propaganda instrument for spreading philosophical ideas;

"2. If it did not create the revolutionary doctrines, Masonry nevertheless elaborated them;

"3. Freemasonry, in this transformation of society by means of ideas, was not content to adapt principles to individuals. Very quickly it devoted itself to finding practical means of realizing its ideas. . . . It was on this account the true creator, not of principles, but of revolutionary practice;

"4. Finally, apart from this role, Masonry established itself as the great propagandist of the newest beliefs."

Therefore,

"Masonry well and truly, and almost despite itself, bore the weight of this constituent revolution; for it had not only, indeed, preached its doctrines; it had also prepared its leaders and, imprudently perhaps, supported certain practices deriving from the Old Regime, which, put into effect very quickly overtook their Masonic inspiration and foreshadowed the days of August and September 1792."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 145)

The second phase in the role of French Freemasonry in the preparation of the Revolution lay in the propagation of revolutionary doctrine. The Freemasons controlled the elections of March-April 1789.

"They were in many ways part of its work, and we must now examine this point in detail."

Freemasonry was a primary influence on the drafting of the cahiers de doléances, or lists of grievances which the people had been asked to send in from all over the country in 1789.

"The identity of the draughtsmanship has struck even the least critical scholars . . . and so some were led to try and discover if the cahiers were not based on models that had been circulated from district to district."

This investigation led very quickly to the discovery that instructions, or general models of the cahiers, had been distributed throughout the country.

"We cannot help but be struck by the fact that all these instructions were of Masonic origin."

The result was that half the deputies elected to the States-General were Freemasons and G. Martin summarises their influence thus:

"A bloc was formed in the third state that was led by Masonry, and we will see in a minute how and by what means this came about. This group was cohesive, it had a very clear understanding of its aims, it had experience of parliamentary debates, and a discipline at the beginning that was almost perfect. In numbers it represented almost half the Assembly and the great majority

belonged to the Masonic order. But it would have been powerless if the old misguided ideas of voting by order had been maintained. It therefore worked on deputies of other orders who were impressed by its unity and determination, and owing to the Masonic elements amongst them, it succeeded in disrupting them between 5th May and 23rd June. It thus brought about the capitulation of the king and the triumph of the reform. It is difficult in these conditions to overestimate the services rendered by Masonry to the nascent Revolution." (G. Martin, *ibid.*, p.185)

The deputies were actually closely supervised by means of an organisation called the "bureau de correspondance" according to the details revealed by G. Martin:

"The Freemasons did not cease to direct parliamentary opinion, and the 'bureau de correspondance' was the link between the Masonic lodges, the public and the deputies."

And elsewhere he writes:

"No less important was the financial help given by Masonry to the work of reform. Such an upheaval could not be put into operation successfully without vast expense. However Masonry did not limit its help to time and intellectual activity but gave its money too." (G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 195)

For Masonry possessed powerful financial resources.

"The two main ways in which it spent its resources appear to have been in the printing and distribution of pamphlets which served as models for the cahiers and in the equipment of groups of young people who helped both to bring about the triumph of the new ideas and to maintain order during the rural anarchy at the beginning of 1789."

The Freemasons also supported many charities, some of which obviously enabled them to acquire influence over the populace by playing on their ignorance and prejudices.

"What is absolutely certain", says G. Martin, "was the fact that, in the event of trouble, the mob, having forcibly demonstrated in favour of reform, would be supported financially by the Masonic lodges."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 108)

Thus,

"by subsidizing hand bills, by publishing posters, by aiding

victims of the civil war and by financing opposition, Freemasonry secretly but effectively aided and abetted the electoral campaign which led to the convocation of the States-General.

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 204)

"In the meantime, the assembly of the Estates-General was getting itself organized at Versailles. There again the role of Masonry was to be preponderant."

The closely organized group of Masonic deputies succeeded in dominating the assembly.

"From as early as the end of May, the theory of a Masonic society of representatives had become a reality. But it was not to stay closed like a temple, as the non-Masonic deputies might have been tempted to set up in opposition to it a group which could easily have become hostile. It was enough that the leaders were Masons, and that the spirit of the club was Masonic, for the principle to be safeguarded and the necessary concentration (of force) established."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 208)

The third phase is the active revolutionary role played by Freemasonry in the French Revolution. This is a dangerous field, as G. Martin knows better than anyone; consequently he deals with it in a much vaguer manner.

He shows us how Freemasonry introduced popular leaders whom it thought it could employ usefully, and inversely, how Masons were sent to harangue the people.

"Their Masonic background was unknown to those they harangued: often they were clever enough to convince their audience that it had initiated action itself; they controlled it with out imposing themselves:"

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 226)

Freemasonry, not content with tirades only, organized the proletariat as well, but with the object of maintaining order as much as to uphold its principles.

Little by little, with the help of their network, the Masons invaded the royal government, succesfully introducing the ideas of reform, and finally they penetrated the army.

"Nevertheless Freemasonry would have perhaps experienced much more difficulty in achieving the practical realisation of its doctrines had it not received, during the last years of the century, the support of a large section of the army. Historians who have

drawn our attention to this fact seem to have grasped but imperfectly the root cause of it, which was the spread of lodges in military circles. . . .

"The Old Regime collapsed partly because the French army and its officers did not attempt to come to its aid. Here again the consequences of Masonic propaganda surpassed the expectations of its military promoters. By the help it brought to the incipient Revolution, Masonry in the army formed an essential element in the triumph of the new ideas; it may even be suggested that without it, the great work would have been seriously compromised."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 274)

G. Martin, who brings his study to an end before the outbreak of the actual Revolution, concludes with these words:

"The importance of Masonry in the Revolution must not be underestimated. Doubtless the great majority of romantic legends—daggers, traitors and cloaks of operatic repertory—have neither foundation in, nor the consistency of, truth, and Masonry has rightly pointed out the bad faith of those who accuse it of such childish absurdities. But, apart from these pathetic and deliberate falsehoods, the fact remains that Masonry was the recognized or hidden soul of all the popular and social movements which as a whole constituted the Revolution. Masonry created the need which transformed into creative action the potentialities for emancipation which, without it, would either have remained latent or miscarried from lack of co-ordination and the impotency of spasmodic and divergent efforts."(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 284)

One objection is frequently raised when the role of Freemasonry in the Revolution of 1789 is discussed:

It is absurd, people say, to attribute an important part to Freemasonry in the preparation of the Revolution, since the Revolution caused the lodges to be closed and numerous Masonic leaders finally fell victim to it.

This argument, though apparently logical, is in fact absolutely invalid. All the successive revolutions since 1789 have backfired against their instigators, who have generally ended by killing one another.

Gaston Martin answers this objection in his book. He deals successively with the role of the nobility, the clergy, and the army in Freemasonry.

Firstly the nobility:

"Whether attracted by the novelty, a taste for mystery, or a

false air of worldly masquerade and comic opera, Masonry—that 'sentimental gathering', as le Forestier called it, and which is all it would appear to be to a superficial observer, Masonry attracted a number of men about town even from the Queen's entourage.

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 104)

"The Abbe Barruel, whose abundant documentation cannot be disputed, perfectly understood that the membership of such nobles as Mgr. de la Rochefoucauld, Worshipful Master of the Lodge of the rue du Coq-Heron, was a stumbling block to his thesis. His explanation only confirms our deductions on this matter.

"To the honour of the unfortunate Duke de la Rochefoucauld, we hasten to say that the Revolution at least made him recognize his error. He had become Grand Master of various Masonic lodges; he was the instrument of Condorcet and of Sieyes, who used his money for the great enterprise. When he perceived the disorganisation to which France was on the point of succumbing after the reign of the first Constituent Assembly, his enthusiasm for the cause cooled, and he actually renounced it. We do not wish to make any other point; for it is obvious that neither the nobility which supported reform, nor the bourgeois Third Estate, foresaw the democratic evolution of the movement which they were preparing. As it developed, Freemasons left the order in increasing numbers." (G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 105)

Next the clergy:

"It was above all in the regular and lower clergy—the figures quoted by Leonce Maitre are very indicative in this respect—that the Masons abounded. Through them the Masonic ideal reached a double public: middle-class youth, taught by the former, and the parish priests and curates in the country, who belonged to the second category, and through whom could be reached the best-educated of the country folk...

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 108)

"This philosophic action on the part of the regular clergy did not escape the attention of the ecclesiastical authorities, who expressed concern about it repeatedly. They hoped the regular clergy would observe stricter conformity to their traditional duties. But this they visibly failed to achieve.

"The influence of the regular clergy was therefore considerable in the propagation of the Masonic idea; it was all the greater because it was less the result of regular dogmatic preaching than of daily doses mixed with the very substance of their teaching.

"The parish priests could not help but exert an immense moral influence at a time when they were almost the only people who could capture the popular imagination. Charitable works, civil matters, and education all came to them; the presbytery was town hall, hospital and often also the school and study; the country could only see through the eyes of its priests; if one compares this fact with the high number of Masonic priests, one will not be surprised by the almost unanimous support that the countryside gave to the principles of the cahiers.

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, pp. 109-111, 112)

"Scarcely two years later, after these events, most of these priests recovered themselves, and, fearing a formal schism, returned to tradition; this was the moment when the religious insurrection began, the origin of the wars of the Vendee; but for the moment in France 'there existed a proletariat of the clergy and this proletariat also was turning towards the lightening horizon.' The illumination of the horizon came from the flame lit in the temples, a flame which coloured the as yet indistinct plans, shrouded in the mists of the future."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 113)

And finally the army:

Gaston Martin provides us with precise information about the penetration of the lodges into the framework of the army, and he adds:

"It would be useless to conceal the gravity of such an attitude. Those who approved displayed unheard of ingenuousness, when they subsequently deplored the scant success of their attempts to stop the movement which had been unleashed. The officers and men who took part in it had only two courses open to them: either to follow to the end the reform that was the whole purpose of Masonry, or to cut themselves off, aware of their powerlessness to arrest the torrent whose eruption they had provoked. Doubtless the majority adopted the second solution; but we have limited our study to the preparation of the Revolution, not to its ulterior development, and in 1789 there was no perceptible crack in the Masonic bloc of the young army.

"When the split took place between the left wing of the Constituent Assembly and the aristocratic right; when the army saw its ranks crumble away through emigration, the N.C.O.s of the Old Regime formed the framework on which the patriotic forces were reconstructed: Hoche, Marceau, Kleber, Augereau, and others. Whether or not they belonged to lodges, they had been

infected by their spirit, which had invaded nearly all the regiments and whence they drew their unflinching zeal, which they were to bring a little later to the defence of the Republic. It has not been remarked upon sufficiently that the sans-culotte army only owed its fighting strength to this amalgamation, and that it was because it could be straddled that it triumphed.

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, p. 274)

"The Old Regime collapsed partly because the French Army and its officers did not attempt to come to its aid. Here again the consequences of Masonic propaganda surpassed the expectations of its military promoters.

"The military lodges were a fine instrument of national emancipation, and if we are to summarize their role and importance concisely, we would say that:

"1. The first effect of Masonic propaganda in the army was to disrupt the loyal troops. It opposed the doctrine of the army, strictly in the service of the King, with that of a national force which owed primary loyalty to the general will. It therefore smashed in the hands of the aristocrats the one certain instrument of repression which, had it been used in 1789, would very likely have been sufficient to have stifled the nascent Revolution.

"2. The Masonic ideal opened the way for certain obscure or inexperienced army leaders to reflect on their future and change their vocation. While, for example, Dumouriez was a mediocre recruit, one could not say the same of La Fayette, de Canclaux, or many others. "3. Finally, and especially, from 1788, the admission of N.C.O.s prepared the ranks of the revolutionary army which was to stand up to the coalition of Monarchist Europe. It was from the military lodges that they drew the ideas, well aware of their value, of which they were to become the indomitable defenders and the proud propagandists. "Thus no more in this respect than in any other, did the work of French Masonry display anything resembling a conspiracy.

"The military lodges functioned to the knowledge of all the established powers. The officers who belonged to them for the most part emigrated during the troubled period of 1791-1792.

"By the help it brought to the incipient Revolution, military Masonry in the army formed an essential element in the triumph of the new ideas; it may even be suggested that without it, the great work would have been seriously compromised."

(G. Martin, *ibid.*, pp. 275-276)

The texts we have reproduced above are written in clear and simple language. There is really no need to pass comment on them, for they are self-explanatory. However, it would be simplifying matters too much to say that Freemasonry was the sole animating force behind the French Revolution; such large and complex movements cannot be explained by one cause alone. Freemasonry was only one of the elements involved in the Revolution, but it is an element whose importance only ignorance or bad faith can deny.

COMMUNISM AND FREEMASONRY

IN his second work, *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*, Mellor deals at length with the relations between Freemasonry and Communism. His conclusion is quite explicit: they are diametrically opposite to one another.

"Today Communism has not yet reached the peak of its trajectory; accordingly, we do not have to formulate hypotheses about its immediate future, that is to say, we do not have to calculate where and when it will cease to progress and begin to decline. The only question of interest is what will happen when it comes up against the fact of Masonry. . . .

"How prodigious is the error of their common enemies in regarding them as allies, or as if Communism was a fruit fallen from the Masonic tree. This is what the Spanish Penal Code has done, by lumping them together under a single heading in Appendix III of the said Code.

"There is therefore direct opposition between Freemasonry and the Communist world, despite the obstinate error of those who professionally pursue error, the Catholic integralists, and despite also the illusions of certain elements in the Grand Orient of France.

"Is not the existence of this opposition sufficient to indicate in what alternative direction Freemasonry, anxious to survive, cannot but help align itself?"

(A. Mellor: *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*, pp. 431,447)

The Masonic writer G. Vinatrel goes still further; in the book which he has devoted to this question, one will find that he considers that Masonry is a barrier against Communism.

"Communism is the fundamental enemy of Freemasonry.

"All Freemasons are unanimous in considering that a man who is enslaved by dogma, who leaves it to others to do his thinking for him and to decide on his behalf, has no place in Freemasonry. This liberty of thought, which is the absolute right of the individual, is the accompaniment of individual liberty in society.

"Communists, on the contrary, take it for granted from the outset, that a small group of men forming a so-called 'Central Committee' has the right to control the thoughts of other men without consulting them.

"The fundamental opposition of Communist principles to those of Freemasonry implies the existence of an implacable hostility between them from the outset, at all times and in all places; for Communism has discovered that Freemasonry is one of the forces, perhaps even the only real force, which could one day knock it out of the ring.

"Whether or not the Freemason invokes the name of the Great Architect of the Universe, according to the rite which he obeys, it is always the case that he believes in man. The Communist believes only in his own party. That is the whole difference."

(G. Vinatrel: *Communisme et Franc-Maçonnerie*, pp. 81, 115)

But is it really a fact that this antinomy exists between Communism and Freemasonry, as these two writers ask us to believe? It is a complex problem, to which it is not easy to reply categorically "Yes" or "No". This doubt always arises when it is a question of anything to do with Freemasonry, in which everything is cloudy, fluid, unformulated and impossible to grasp. Let us try and clarify our perspective.

What is the view of the Vatican and the Catholic Hierarchy? The Popes are by no means in agreement with Mellor on this point. Leo XIII in 1884, Pius XI in 1937, the Association of the Bishops of the Argentine in 1959, to quote only the principal authorities, flatly state the opposite.

In the Encyclical *Humanum Genus*, Leo XIII analyses the problem in the following words:

"In the sphere of politics, the Naturalists lay down that all men have the same rights and that all are equal and alike in every respect; that everyone is by nature free and independent; that no one has the right to exercise authority over another; that it is an act of violence to demand of men obedience to any authority not emanating from themselves. All power is, therefore, in the free people. Those who exercise authority do so either by the mandate or by the permission of the people, so that, when the popular will changes, rulers of State may lawfully be deposed even against their will. The source of all rights and civic duties is held to reside either in the multitude or in the ruling power in the State, provided that it has been constituted according to the new principles. They hold also that the State should not acknowledge God and that, out of the various forms of religion, there is no reason why one should

be preferred to another. According to them, all should be on the same level.

"Now, that these views are held by the Freemasons also, and that they want to set up States constituted according to this ideal, is too well known to be in need of proof. For a long time they have been openly striving with all their strength and with all the resources at their command to bring this about. They thus prepare the way for those numerous and more reckless spirits who, in their mad desire to arrive at equality and common ownership of goods, are ready to hurl society into an even worse condition, by the destruction of all distinctions of rank and property. . . .

"In this mad and wicked design, the implacable hatred and thirst for vengeance with which Satan is animated against Our Lord Jesus Christ becomes almost visible to our bodily eyes."

(*ibid.*, pp. 13-14)

And further on in the same Encyclical, Leo XIII added:

"From the anti-social character of the errors we have mentioned, it is clear that the greatest dangers are to be feared for States. For once the fear of God and the reverence due to His laws have been taken away, the authority of rulers treated with contempt, free reign and approval given to sedition, popular passions recklessly fanned, and all restraining influences eliminated except the fear of punishment, then there will necessarily follow a revolutionary upheaval and a period of wholesale destruction of existing institutions.

"A complete change and upheaval of this kind is being carefully prepared by numerous associations of Communists and Socialists, in fact, it is their openly avowed aim; and Freemasonry is not only not opposed to their plans, but looks upon them with the greatest favour, as its leading principles are identical with theirs. If the Freemasons do not immediately and everywhere proceed to realise the ultimate conclusions contained in these principles, this is not because they are restrained by the discipline of the organization or by lack of determination, but partly on account of the power and virtue of that divine religion which cannot be crushed out of existence, and partly because the more balanced part of mankind are unwilling to sink into slavery under the domination of secret societies, and offer vigorous resistance to their insane endeavours."

(*ibid.*, pp. 16-17)

On 23rd May, 1958, in an address to the 7th week of Pastoral Adaptation, Pius XII mentioned that the roots of modern apostasy lay in scientific atheism, dialectical materialism, rationalism, ilium-

inism, laicism, and Freemasonry—which was the mother of them all.

On 20th February, 1959, the Plenary Assembly of the Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops of the Argentine, under the presidency of Cardinal Caggiano, published a long collective declaration on Freemasonry, from which we have taken the following passages:

"In the course of its plenary reunion, the Argentinian Hierarchy, confronted by various articles published in the Press by Freemasonry, felt obliged to make a public declaration to the faithful, following the recommendation of Leo XIII to 'first of all, tear away the mask from Freemasonry and let it be seen as it really is'...

"In 1958, the IVth Interamerican Conference of Freemasonry, which was held in Santiago, Chile, declared that 'the Order helps all its members to obtain important posts in the public life of the nations.' After this came a dissertation on the theme of 'The Defence of Laicism', to be followed by directions as to the new tactics to be adopted by Freemasonry, which coincide with the latest instructions of the Communist International. Freemasons are to work for the triumph of laicism in all walks of life, and Communists are to subvert social order in order to create a favourable terrain in which to achieve their ends. This is how the instruction is worded: 'Intensify the campaign of laicisation through the intermediary influence of the different political parties. Try and appease the alarm of the Catholic Church at Freemasonry by avoiding direct Masonic action. Intensify the action which will unsettle the unity of the working-class movements, so that they may the more easily be stifled afterwards. Freemasonry and Communism for the moment are pursuing the same objective in Latin America, which is why they must try and work together in the best possible way, without allowing the slightest sign of their alliance to become public....'

"Proof that this is no dream is The Second International Congress for Universal Fraternity.

"World Freemasonry and Communism are preparing for a Congress which will be held at Montevideo, called 'The Second International Congress for Universal Fraternity'. It is a Masonic Congress of Communist inspiration which aims to subordinate the Masonic ideal of 'universal fraternity' to the expansion of the Soviet Communist International. The congress will take place in Holy Week, from 26th to 28th March, and its object is to prepare for the struggle for human confraternity and world peace'...

"To achieve its ends, Freemasonry uses high finance, high

politics and the world press; Marxism, on the other hand, uses the social and economic revolution against the country, the family, property, morality and religion.

"Freemasons achieve their ends by secretly subversive means, Communists by openly subversive movements. Freemasonry activates sectarian political minorities; Communism relies on mass political movements, exploiting their aspirations to social justice....

"Every Argentinian, and especially the young, should know that Catholicism and Freemasonry are completely contradictory and self-exclusive, like Christ and anti-Christ. Also they ought to know that Liberalism or laicism, under whatever form it may take, is the very embodiment of Masonic ideology.

"The Church of Christ presides over every level of the life of our country. It is present, vigilant and active in every important event in our history. Catholicism is the origin, the root and the essence of the people of Argentine. In other words, to make an attempt on Catholicism is to conspire against one's native country.

"We draw the attention of all who love their country to the two enemies of our traditions and our future greatness, Freemasonry and Communism, which are seeking the destruction of everything that is noble and sacred in our land.

"Given at the Villa San Ignacio, on 20th February in the Year of Our Saviour 1959, and signed by Cardinal Caggiano, president of the Plenary Assembly of the Argentinian Hierarchy, and by the Argentinian Archbishops and Bishops present at the reunion."

In 1961, Monseigneur Perraudin, Archbishop of Ruanda in Africa, on his return from Europe, addressed a letter to all the priests of his diocese, in which he said:

"It is impossible to give even a brief account in this letter of all the journeys and approaches that I have made in Europe. My visits and my contacts have shown me how completely they support us in Europe in these difficult times. I have encountered many most praiseworthy and generous gestures of help.

"My dominant impression, however, is that insufficient account is taken in Europe of the amplitude of the struggle for which the whole of Africa is the prize; Communism and Freemasonry are playing a satanic gamble for it, and the older Christian countries do not sufficiently understand that it is the Church of which they are members, their own Church, which is in mortal danger in Africa.

"The people in Europe are very little informed, indeed they are often badly misinformed, about the situation...."

(Quoted in the Catholic review *Verbe*, July-August 1961, p. 66)

Let us now examine the facts in the light of modern history: the real history, the one which does not appear in official books.

Freemasons as a whole are not Communists; nevertheless, everywhere Freemasonry has prepared the ground for the coming and triumph of Communism, very often without the knowledge of its members, many of whom would probably have been terrified if they had seen clearly where the principles which they propagated with such ardour and unawareness were leading.

It was the same story in 1789; the majority of the Masons who had contributed to the unleashing of the French Revolution, themselves fell victims to it. It was the same in Russia in 1917 and in Spain in 1936, and indeed it was the same in almost all the modern revolutions.

Today, there are a number of Masons, such as the ex-prefect Baylot, who belongs to the small group of the Neuilly Lodge, which is recognised by the Grand Lodge of England, who have struggled openly and very courageously against Communism; but that is a far cry from accepting that Freemasonry is innocent of any collusion with Communism, and numerous facts can be brought in support of the assertion that there is collusion between the two.

Firstly, throughout the nineteenth century and up to the Second World War, the various Masonries of the Grand Orient have been violently anti-Christian as regards religion, and they have also been militantly active, as regards politics, on the side of Socialism, which has become more and more radical. A perusal of the reports of the Grand Orient will bring to light numerous examples of this fact. The Masonic historian, Gaston Martin, sums up the situation when he says, in his *Manuel d'Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie en France*, (p. 252):

"All Freemasons of the three obediences which are on friendly relations with one another belong to what in politics is called 'the Left'. The shades of doctrine which divide them are not such as to hinder agreement among all their members."

There is therefore an affinity of concepts and interests in these two vital fields (that is to say, religion and politics); and Freemasonry lays down as its party line of action: "no enemies on the left".

Secondly, several times during this period between the two World Wars there was close political collusion between Freemasonry and Communism; striking examples are the Popular Fronts in France and Spain, which were alliances of left-wing parties, including Communists, under the aegis of Freemasonry.

And thirdly, the numerous revolutions which have disturbed modern Europe and led to bloodshed have generally been triggered

off with the efficacious help of Freemasonry; since 1905 these revolutions have become more and more Socialist and Communist in tendency.

A particularly flagrant example is to be found in the European revolutions of 1917 and 1918.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 was fomented at the height of the First World War with the help of international Freemasonry, and the principal leaders of the Kerensky regime were Masons; this movement quickly degenerated into Bolshevism.

All the revolutions which overthrew the monarchist regimes of Central Europe in 1918 were inspired and directed by Masons, and it was Masons who were given posts in the new governments of Hungary, Germany, Austria and Czecho Slovakia. Almost all these revolutions rapidly degenerated into bloody convulsions with distinctly Communist tendencies, under Bela Kun, Liebnecht, Rosa Luxembourg, Kurt Eisner and others.

It would take too long to relate in detail the part played by Freemasonry in all these revolutions. We will only examine its action in Hungary—a very interesting country from this point of view, since after the Bolshevist revolution of Bela Kun, the government seized and published the Masonic archives, which reveal Masonry's blatant connection with the revolutionary movement.

On 29th April, 1918, the Grand Master of Hungarian Freemasonry, Dr. Arpad Bokay, delivered an extremely patriotic speech in Vienna, in the course of which he said:

"The enemies of Hungary are also the enemies of Austria; those who are in league to destroy Austria wish to do the same to Hungary; it is the monarchy which, amid the tempest of the world war, has most effectively protected the peoples of Austria-Hungary..."

In November of the same year the Imperial Government was overthrown, and on the first page of the first number of its Bulletin, which could now appear without hindrance, Viennese Masonry hailed the event with these words:

"The new state of things came as a surprise. All at once we had become free republicans, masters of ourselves. We were no longer the slaves and martyrs of a bureaucratic government servilely cringing to absolutism and militarism."

(Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung, No. 1/2, May 1919, p. 1)

For his part, Dr. Arpad Bokay made a significant speech on 2nd November, 1918, of which the following extracts have been taken

from the Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung. It is important to bear in mind at this point that the revolutionary government of Karolyi had just been formed.

"This masonic programme (which he had just described) is also the programme of the national Hungarian council and of the popular government which has just been formed.

"Our way is thus made clear to us.

"We are marching shoulder to shoulder with them, we are working with them and we are helping them in their great and weighty, but noble task so that the Hungary of old may unperturbed enter the blessed land of the new Hungary, which is the most ardent wish of every good patriot.

"Our elder and highly esteemed brothers are working today in the first line, and that entirely reassures us, for we know them and we know that they will carry out in a Masonic spirit the work which they have undertaken."

(Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung, No. 1/2, May 1919, p. 41)

The same article added in a footnote that six Freemasons belonged to the first Hungarian republican government in the capacity of ministers, secretaries of State, and under-Secretaries.

With the advent of Bela Kun, Freemasonry was confronted with certain difficulties, for by an ironical twist of fate, it was held to be too bourgeois and was distrusted.

After the collapse of Bolshevism, the Hungarian government dissolved the lodges and published their archives. In their distress the Hungarian Masons called upon their brethren throughout the world, and it was then that the Masonic newspaper, *Latomia*, of Leipzig, published the following interesting article:

"We are able to give the following information concerning the sad fate of Freemasons in Hungary from information supplied by one of our Hungarian brothers resident in Nuremberg.

"After the catastrophe the Freemasons, who had sent another address of welcome to the Emperor Franz-Joseph during the war, fervently embraced the socialist republican ideology out of the noble conviction that the time had come when the Masonic ideal would be accomplished. In their writings they made active propaganda in its favour and most of the leaders were Freemasons.

"But next, when Hungary was overwhelmed by a wave of Bolshevism, the men in power soon began to oppress Masonry as a bourgeois institution.

"The reaction which, thanks to foreign assistance, shortly afterwards set in and succeeded in regaining power, inspired by clerical

leadership, closed the lodges, occupied their premises, seized their funds and anything else they found there. . . .

"In their distress, our Hungarian brothers turned to the North American Grand Lodges. The result was that, as Hungary was then negotiating a loan in America, the reply came back that this loan could not be considered until lawful institutions were reestablished in Hungary—a clear allusion to the prohibition of Freemasonry.

"Thereupon the Hungarian government was obliged to open negotiations with the ex-Grand Master. The free resumption of Masonic work was proposed to him, on condition that non-Masons should have the right of access to the sessions. This was naturally refused by the Grand Master and the loan miscarried."

(Latomia of Leipzig, No. 2/3, 1922, p. 31)

A number of conclusions of the utmost importance arise from this brief article; among others, that:

(1) From its own admission, Freemasonry played a directing part in the Hungarian Socialist revolution, which very rapidly degenerated into the horrors of Bolshevism;

(2) American Freemasonry came to the help of Hungarian Freemasonry when it was banned by law in Hungary. This proves the international liaison of universal Freemasonry, and shows that the divergences which separate Anglo-Saxon Freemasonry from the continental variety are effaced when vital interests are at stake;

(3) International Freemasonry intervenes in the internal politics of certain countries and wields enough power to cause international loans to fall through;

(4) Freemasonry considers that the secrecy of its proceedings is so vital to its activity and its power that it prefers to be dissolved rather than to allow a government to scrutinise its internal affairs.

Finally, it is important to remember that all these conditions flow from the avowal of a Masonic journal; they are therefore of indisputable authenticity.

To come nearer to our own times, let us consider the role of Freemasonry in the Spanish Revolution.

The revolution which overthrew the Spanish monarchy, and the civil war which was its outcome, are a tragic example of the destruction caused by Masonry.

Like most of the European revolutions since 1917, this one began under the slogan of liberalism and democracy. It soon brought about disorder, social conflicts, chaos, and finally left all the other left-wing parties in the grip of Communism. Yet, under the Popular

Front, the alliance of the Freemasons and the left-wing parties, including Communism, held fast throughout the revolution until it was finally obliterated by the Spanish Nationalist uprising.

We will now submit to the reader documents which will serve to enlighten our understanding of this subject, and which leave no doubt whatever as to the part played by Freemasonry in the Spanish Revolution.

"The Day after the Dictatorship" was the title of the following article by F. Coty, which was published in *Le Figaro* on 2nd March, 1931, one month before the triumph of the Spanish Revolution, and which, because of its singular importance, we reproduce here almost in its entirety.

"We have said that the faults committed by the Spanish Dictatorship had ended at last by compromising the numerous and important favourable results which it had obtained at the beginning. We have enumerated some of these faults. But the most serious was certainly its entrance, ill-prepared and unorganised, into the struggle against Spanish Freemasonry....

(*Le Figaro*, 1st March, 1931)

"For Primo de Rivera, who understood vaguely the evil work being done by the lodges, made the mistake of attacking Spanish Freemasonry, alarming it and scotching it, but in the end leaving it all its power to do harm.

"In 1928, knowing that he was being secretly combated by the sect, which on the other side of the Pyrenees has a particularly uncompromising revolutionary spirit (we have but to recall the Masonic Anarchist, Ferrer, who was truly typical of the Spanish Mason), he ordered investigations to be made at the headquarters of the Grand Orient of Madrid and the Grand Symbolic Lodge of Barcelona. This would have been a reasonable move if it had been the opening of a resolute offensive. But it was anything but that.

"A number of Masonic documents were seized and submitted to the examination of men whose loyalty to the Dictatorship was above suspicion, but whose competence, unfortunately, in such a specialised matter, was not equal to the task they had been set. For they were soon disconcerted by the strange 'jargon' or phraseology employed by the lodges and understood by only a few specialists outside Masonry. The enquiry dragged on interminably while the investigators strove to thread their way through a labyrinth of Masonic degrees and symbols. The real way in which the sect functioned and its revolutionary activity escaped them altogether. Thus the enquiry was inconclusive, and far from diminishing the noxiousness of the Spanish Lodges, rather provided them

with an opportunity, which they did not fail to seize, of appealing to the solidarity of International Freemasonry. Evidence of this solidarity was, as ever, immediately forthcoming in favour of the 'persecuted brethren'. Thus the Dictatorship, which at first had been regarded quite favourably in foreign countries, notably in the Anglo-Saxon world, where order and possessions are esteemed, now found ranged against it, almost overnight, a world-wide coalition of the Press and of Masonic influences.

"Systematic attacks on Primo de Rivera were the consequences of this challenge. Their special target was the exchange rate of the peseta, which the Dictator had left unstabilised because he hoped to restore the gold standard. The same politico-financial forces, which have so often attacked French credit, now worked against Spanish credit, and had no difficulty in compromising it. The peseta dropped by 33%. At last his opponents had got hold of a serious grievance against the Dictator, one which affected the material interests of the whole Spanish people. This they turned to pitiless account against him.

"We have pointed out the other errors committed by Primo de Rivera, errors which, taken together, sufficed to bring about his downfall. But the error of declaring open war on Spanish Freemasonry without striking a serious blow was the greatest of all his mistakes. It suddenly changed the international status of the Dictatorship and provoked a formidable coalition against it.

"Meanwhile, Spanish Freemasonry, recognising the threat to its existence, redoubled its intrigues in the Administration, the Army and the trade unions. The tension became so great that the King himself asked the man who had served him so faithfully to pacify the country, but this time by his withdrawal.

"That step, however, left out of account the agitators among the Masons, who finding the occasion favourable, remained under arms and continued their offensive while changing only their objective. Instead of condemning the Dictatorship they attacked the Monarchy itself. Instead of working for the downfall of Primo de Rivera they sought to dethrone the King, notwithstanding that they had assured him a few months previously that they did not want to involve him in the struggle. Their international accomplices all came out in support of the attack on Alfonso XIII and set to work to prepare public opinion for a Socialist-Republican revolution in Spain. Leon Blum's falsetto added its piercing note to the chorus, while Jean Longuet, a past master in the art of conspiracy, went to Madrid in April 1930 to give a last word of advice to the conspirators.

"In June violent agitation commenced with revolutionary strikes

at Malaga, Granada and Cordova. Sedition raised its voice among the peasants of Andalusia. A campaign of meetings demanding the establishment of a Socialist Republic deeply disturbed the inhabitants of the big towns. Whipping up feeling, co-ordinating the activities of the various bodies opposed to the Government, inducing discontented monarchists to collaborate with bourgeois republicans, and trade union officials with declared revolutionaries, Spanish Freemasonry briskly led the attack. Soon blood flowed in tragic clashes.

"Then came military mutinies in Aragon, and at the aerodrome of Cuatro Vientos outside Madrid. A few defects in the preparation of the rising caused the failure of the movement as a whole, though conceived according to the best Masonic and Carbonarist traditions. The military lodge at Jaca marched too soon, and the Masonic captains Galan and Hernandez were shot before they could be succoured by their fellow-conspirators in other garrisons, but not before they had caused the death of many in the defence of order.

"In order to judge the part played by Spanish Freemasonry in these events, and what it expected to gain if the plot succeeded, it suffices to study the list of the members of the Provisional Government, which the conspirators of Jaca and of the Madrid aerodrome had agreed to proclaim in the event of their success:

"President: *Alcala Zamora*.¹ Members: Indalecio Prieto, Miguel Maura, Alexander Lerroux, Fernando de los Rios, Manuel Azana, Santiago Casarás, Alvaro de Albornoz, Largo Caballero, Martinez Barrio and Nicolau d'Olwer. All the names we have put in italics, eight out of eleven, are those of militant Freemasons. As Benois, former Chief of the French Judiciary Police, said recently concerning the Oustric scandal: These gentlemen had met in the lodges'.

"The only reason for the inclusion of three non-Masons in the Provisional Government drawn up by Spanish Freemasonry was to establish contact between the conspirators and the malcontents of the Right (*Miguel Maura*), the Navy (*Santiago Casarás*), and the Catalan element (*Nicolau d'Olwer*).

"After this attempt at revolution, which was nipped in the bud, Alfonso XIII, manifestly at a loss, accepted the principle of constitutional revision, and on this the efforts of his assailants were now to be brought to bear. For they hoped to obtain from this step what mutiny in the Army had not, as yet, been able to secure.

¹ It is not absolutely certain that *Alcala Zamora* was a Freemason. It is a point which has still to be cleared up. I myself have read a passage in a Masonic review which stated that he was not. It is true that in this respect one cannot rely blindly on Masonic assertions—*Leon de Poncins*.

The tenacity of the Masons is clearly shown in the doggedness of their efforts against a regime to which Spain is indebted for half a century of social peace and prosperity."

(Le Figaro, 2nd March, 1931)

This article was a veritable prophecy, as the course of events was soon to show. For the Spanish Socialist Republican Government was indeed constituted exactly as the above article foretold, and Freemasonry gloried in the role which it had played in the revolution and the places which its adepts took in the new government.

The following extracts are taken from the Argentinian Masonic review, *La Cadena de Union*, which is very well informed about Spanish affairs. We quote from some of its most typical passages in which the same ideas are found expressed in different form.

"We found the Monarchy an obstacle to the historical march of the country and we have got rid of it . . . but the Monarchy is not the only obstacle. . . .

"Our task now is to uproot the whole mediaeval structure with its two powerful supports, the Monarchy and the Vatican."

(Article by A. Labriola in *Cadena de Union*, July 1931)

"As the new Spanish Republic gains in political solidarity, both internally and externally, one can see clearly how with the collapse of the Monarchy, an out of date institution no longer in harmony with the liberal ideas of the century in which we live, the pernicious power of Roman Catholic clericalism is also in process of disappearing from Spain for ever—this power that has for so long sustained at intermittent intervals a succession of violent quarrels in the political life of the Iberian peninsula, perfidious casuistry and lying quibbles, which fill the greater part of history with their resounding scandals. . . .

". . . Soon the Constitutional Assembly will be convoked to proclaim the transformation of the Spanish Government and to decree the separation of Church and State, which will thus deprive Spanish clericalism of its innumerable privileges.

"The Spanish Republican Government also intends to secularize the schools and to introduce complete liberty of conscience, putting Catholicism on the same level as other religions. . . .

"The Spanish Monarchy could only survive because it had in clericalism a faithful ally that maintained the people in ignorance, superstition and fanaticism."¹

¹ Note that primary and secondary education in Spain was begun and directed by religious establishments—a curious method of keeping people in a state of ignorance.

"To break and bring to nought the power and influence of this very clericalism will be the greatest and noblest task of the new Republic, and if this sublime endeavour is achieved the Spanish Republicans will have rendered an immense service not only to their country but to the whole of humanity, which will owe them a perpetual debt of gratitude for this conquest and emancipation."

(Cadena de Union, May 1931, article by Teodoro de Szigethy)

"Soviet Russia has shown to the whole world that it is no sacrilege to transform a church into a theatre or a Masonic temple.

(Cadena de Union, July 1931, article by M. Lucchini)

"The triumph of Republican-Liberalism in Spain, one of the last bastions of Jesuit clericalism, marks a great stride forward in the pursuit of the ideal of democracy and free thought. It will be a warning to all those who do not wish to or cannot understand that the spiritual progress of humanity can no longer tolerate the dominion of the oppression of ideas any more than religious fanaticism, the greatest and most terrible of the wounds that afflict humanity.

"It is to be hoped that the work of restoration and emancipation undertaken by the Spanish Republicans will be definitely consolidated and that thus Inquisitorial Catholicism, which has been the cause of every corruption in Spain, killing all liberty of thought, profaning the secrets of conscience and annihilating civic liberties, will disappear for ever, and with it all moral and spiritual oppression, thus opening the way for emancipation from outmoded atavisms, and for liberty of thought, for the moral and material well-being of the Spanish people, who after such a long period of suffering and oppression deserve a better fate.

"Times have changed. Progress has dealt the death blow to dictatorship and clerical obscurantism. The Spanish Republic bears witness to it.

(Cadena de Union, April 1931; article by T. Szigethy)

"All praise to the distinguished architects of the redemptive evolution. All praise to our brother Masons who on the other side of the broad Atlantic in the vanguard of world opinion have succeeded in laying the foundations of the great work that the new Spain, the antithesis of the one which has just disappeared, is to accomplish: a happy era of peace, progress and respect."

(Cadena de Union, April 1931, article by M. Gualdi)

In the joy of their success, certain revelations were triumphantly

displayed in favourably disposed secular papers. *El Liberal*, for instance, published an article which was reproduced in the *Boletín oficial del grand oriente español* (No. 61, 10th December, 1931), from which we have taken the following brief extract:

"However, a considerable section of public opinion was frightened of Masonry and certain papers reflected that state of mind. One of them gave a list of the politicians who were Masons. At the head was Lerroux, followed by Fernando de Los Rios and Marcelino Domingo. It is indeed a brilliant list. It includes nearly all the men who had anything to do or say in Spain. . . .

"The best, in this instance as anywhere else, who are not Masons, deserve to be.

"It was as a Mason that the Minister for Public Instruction spoke in Morocco; it is as a Masonic creation that the Government directs us; as a Mason that Lerroux has led the State. After a Jesuit Monarchy it is only natural that a Masonic Republic should act as a liberator . . . (Catholicism) had been on the point of converting Spain into a vast troglodyte cavern. Today the Masons are in power, and it was high time that they should be."

Masonry was disturbed by this awkward publicity for, as we know, it prefers to work in secret, and the *Boletín of the Grand Orient* from which the above passage was taken, continues:

"The statements of our disinterested friends can cause Masonry more harm than all the united attacks of its adversaries.

"It must not be published in the columns of important newspapers that Masonry does in fact rule. That is not certain. In its bosom Masonry shelters politicians whose personality emerges in their public life and it is possible that its principles may have exercised an influence on their inner formation, but Masonry as a body does not interfere in political struggles..

"It is clear that Masonry does not govern the country. But the Government is composed of men among whose numbers some can add to their merits the honour of belonging to the loveliest, the freest, the noblest and holiest institution, the august Masonic Order..."

Naturally, Masonry does not govern. But all the men who govern are Freemasons. That recalls the famous distinction between the Soviet Government and the Third International.

Masonry, says the Freemason Lantoiné (see Leon de Poncins: *La Franc-Maçonnerie d'après ses documents secrets*, 1936), must not openly take part in political struggles, so that no defeat can affect the Order, which remains cleverly concealed in its speculative role.

The Spanish Revolution provides clear proof of the fact that a well-organized minority can profit by a period of unrest to ensure the success of a coup d'etat. It was in fact sufficient for a few Masonic intriguers who held key positions to get together in the lodges and devise a concerted plan of action, to succeed in bringing about the revolution and imposing a Masonic Government on a Catholic and Monarchist country, whose people however held themselves aloof from political struggles.

Once power has been attained it is easy to represent the whole movement as an expression of the people's will, and by remaining in power long enough the opinion of the masses can be moulded in the desired direction. This can be achieved by different means, of which the two principal are the school and the press, and it must be admitted that in work of this kind Freemasonry is supremely accomplished.

In December 1931 the left-wing weekly, *Vu*, published an important article on Spain by the well-known writer, P. Dominique, from which we have taken the following passage dealing with the Spanish Revolution.

"Here we find Freemasonry active again. The people reacted against a spiritual domination which had weighed on them for centuries, but were they directed towards this reaction, and are they still being directed ? There has been a lot of discussion about Masonry, particularly in regard to the Ferrer incident. It has been said that the whole opposition at the time was composed of Masons, and at the present time it seems that at least five members (there are surely others) of the Government are Masons: Largo Caballero, Indalecio Prieto, Marcelino Domingo, Alexander Lerroux and Fernando de Los Rios. These are evident signs of the activity of a counter-church. But how can one build up the State otherwise? The only people who seem logical to us are, on the one hand, Philip II and his successors, or the Basque-Navarre deputies who invoke 'Christ the King', and, on the other hand, the avowed anti-religionists who meet philosophy with philosophy, and Church with counter-Church. The foundation of every State that aims at universality and perpetuity rests on a spiritual basis — for in every state, in every human community, there is an empire which is sometimes unaware of its own existence.

"... Spain, unlike France, was once profoundly theocratic. That gives us reason to think that she could become so once again, but in a sense quite contrary to Catholicism. When the Articles of the Constitution relative to the relations between Church and State were voted, Mr. Azana, who today is President of the Council, apparently declared: 'At last Spain is no longer Catholic'.

"And without doubt the meaning of the future President's thought was: 'At last Catholicism is no longer the State religion'.

"But what if Spain had need of a religion or a state philosophy? The Soviets gave their people one. But if Spain felt such a need what religion, what philosophy—one for which one might die if necessary—would Mr. Azana give to his country?"

(P. Dominique: Vu, 30th December, 1931)

Let us conclude this brief study of the role of Freemasonry in Spain with the report of the Extraordinary General Assembly of the Spanish Grand Orient, held at Madrid on 20th February, 1932, and succeeding days.

This document is of the utmost importance in that it affords us proof of the close surveillance which Masonry exercises over those of its members who hold political positions, and the strict obedience which it exacts of them, an obedience under oath to secret orders, and subject to Masonic penalties in case of transgression.

This is a fact which the Freemasons have denied and of which therefore this document brings us absolutely indisputable evidence. It was published in its entirety in the *Revue Internationale des Societes secretes*, 15th December, 1933.

The following passages are taken from:

Official Bulletin of the Spanish Grand Orient, Madrid, 10th September, 1932, VIth year, No. 64.

"Decisions taken at the extraordinary General Assembly of the Spanish Grand Orient, held at Madrid on 20th February, 1932, and succeeding days.

"First Motion on the Agenda :

"(2) All Freemasons of the Spanish Grand Orient will confirm their oath according to the rank they hold; those absent or impeded will do so in any suitable way, and those present, at the first meeting of the lodge. The Venerable Master will warn the Freemasons that they must renew their oath, verbally or in writing, to be always ready to appear before their respective judges in order to explain and justify the correctness of their Masonic conduct in every action of their Masonic or secular life.

"(6) The Venerable Masters will see to it that those Brother Masons take the oath before the Altar with all solemnity at the Apprentice Lodge, which will in no way prevent the ceremony being repeated at the lodge corresponding to each Brother's degree, the aforesaid oath to be inscribed in the Acts and celebrated with a triple battery of rejoicing.

"(7) The Lodges and Triangles will file a report on each Freemason, on which will be recorded his actual work, the posts he holds or has held in the State or private enterprise, and the reasons for his leaving; as also a record of his meritorious services and Masonic achievements. This file must be specially complete and specific for those Masons holding a political post through popular vote or by Government nomination, such as councillors, deputies, etc. The said files will be sent to the Grand Lodge of the district concerned to be transmitted to the C.P. of the G.S.F.C.

"Second Motion on the Agenda:

"(11a) The Masonic authorities are bound to see to it that, as often as necessary, Freemasons holding public positions renew their oaths to explain and justify their conduct as Masons before their superiors.

"(b) Freemasons in public posts must be reminded of their duty of charity and fraternal tolerance, and care must be taken to see that this spirit of Masonic brotherhood remains above all differences of opinion which may separate them in political contests.

"(c) All this supervision, help and collaboration will depend on the lodge of the Degree concerned, and should be carried out in a spirit of absolute respect for the political views of Masonic brothers, without the slightest trace of partisan spirit but solely for the defence of the great principles of our August Order.

"(12) A vast activity of Masonic propaganda will be organised by means of pamphlets, personal contacts, publication of biographies of great Spanish Masons of the past, and lectures, etc., for the purpose of increasing—always, however, with due discrimination—the number of Masons and the lodges depending on the Spanish Grand Orient.

"(13) In order to be able to determine correctly the immediate or remote projects of Freemasonry, this Assembly should not limit its scope merely to drawing up rules regarding certain concrete facts, but it is its business especially to ratify, recall to mind and explain the fundamental principles which guide the whole movement.

"And this we must do in the religious, political and social spheres.

"It is the function of this Assembly to recall and explain the Masonic principles which, in these three spheres, should inspire the work of Spanish Masonry today and in the future.

"Work in the religious sphere is the most important thing. It is the foundation of all the others, since every political and social doctrine must be erected on an ethical foundation, which in turn is based on metaphysics, or an attempt to explain the order of the

world—such an explanation constituting a religion in the widest and noblest sense of the word.¹

"In the political domain, although there is less occasion for doubt and confusion, it will be a good thing for this Assembly to reassert our faith embodied in the motto: 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity', a faith that is both liberal and democratic, and incompatible with any form of dictatorship, tyranny or despotism, no matter whence it springs.

"With regard to the social sphere, we think that Masonry should hold the same broad and elevated views as in politics. The motto: 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' binds socially as well as politically.

"Our ideal of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity cannot allow one man to be exploited by another, or certain people to live in luxury and idleness, while others are in misery and compelled to work hard. That is the problem which today divides the world into two opposing camps. Freemasonry cannot be indifferent to this problem if it is to survive and continue its work of building the ideal Temple. Freemasonry must draw up a statement of principles condemning the injustice of the economic system under which we live, and just as it has fought for the conquest of political liberties, it must fight for the establishment of a regime of true social justice."

Speaking of the relations between Freemasonry and Communism, Alec Mellor tells us in his second work, *La Franc-Maçonnerie à l'Heure du Choix*, that the Spanish Penal Code has made a prodigious error by lumping these two movements together under a single heading. (For full quotation, see p. 150 above.) But it is not the Spanish Code but Mellor who is making a tragic blunder, in wishing at all costs to acquit Freemasonry of all responsibility in the revolution. This means that he must be either writing in bad faith or else completely ignorant of all the Masonic actions behind the scenes which brought about the Spanish Revolution.

¹ We know what Masonic conceptions about religion mean, and with regard to the relationship of Freemasonry with religion, it is useful to quote here some sentences from the pen of Aulard, a well-known Freemason and Professor of Revolutionary History at the Sorbonne, which put the whole question in its true colours:

"It is absurd to continue to say: we are not aiming at destroying religion, since we are at once obliged to make the opposite assertion, that this destruction is indispensable for the rational foundation of the new political and social State. Let us, therefore, no longer proclaim that we do not want to destroy religion, but, on the contrary, that we do want to destroy religion, in order to set up the new State in its place."

We will conclude this chapter on the relationship between Freemasonry and Communism, with an expose of documents on the agreements arrived at between the Allied leaders at Yalta which were to weigh so heavily on the future of the world.

These documents have been published before, but they have remained isolated and practically unknown; yet they stand out dramatically when they are assembled and related to one another. Once more we shall see Freemasonry, Judaism, and Communism secretly associated in an operation of revolutionary subversion to bring off a gamble which for some years was to place the American government at the service of the Kremlin and of Stalin's policy of world domination.

There is one man whose name is closely connected with the secret agreements concluded at Yalta, preceded and completed by those at Teheran and Potsdam: namely, President Benes of Czechoslovakia —a fact which is all too little known.

After he had deserted from the Austrian army in the 1914 war, Benes was welcomed, together with Masaryk, by the Western allies. With the help of Freemasonry, for which he was all his life a fanatical agent, Benes founded the Czecho-Slovak Government in exile at Versailles and continually benefited from the material and moral help afforded to him by the Western governments, principally the French and the American. As a militant Freemason and a democrat of very advanced ideas, Benes played a great part in international politics, through the Little Entente group of States of which he was the undisputed leader, and by the favour of certain high dignitaries of America. Now, Benes has always been a ferocious partisan and devoted ally of Soviet Russia; it was to cost him his country, his political career and finally his life. Here we shall describe only the little known but essential part which he played in the preparation and conclusion of the Yalta agreement.

The Saturday Evening Post, on 17th April, 1948, published an article by Demaree Bess on the Yalta drama; and almost simultaneously, W. Bullitt, a former ambassador of the United States at Paris, published in Life of 27th September, 1948, a long study on the same subject, under the significant title: "How we won the war and lost the peace". These two articles are of supreme importance; Demaree Bess and W. Bullitt knew intimately the principal figures in the drama, both were direct participants in the Yalta negotiations and both express themselves with great frankness. The facts they bring to light deserve to be studied with great care, for their accounts agree entirely with one another and they are of extreme gravity.

Let us first briefly summarise the essential facts, in so far as they have a direct connection with the Yalta agreement:

Early in 1945, the American general, Patton, succeeded in piercing the German front, and his armoured vehicles, spreading out at top speed, drove deep into Germany; he advanced so quickly that he lost contact with superior command and established his headquarters at Pilsen, about fifty miles from Prague.

What happened then was a mystery which remained incomprehensible until recently, for General Patton stopped dead in his forward thrust. He had plenty of petrol, provisions and fighting spirit. The road to Prague was wide open, yet, to the general amazement, he did not occupy that city. This is what happened: officers of Patton's army entered Prague in a jeep when it was still occupied by the Germans. A colonel of the American intelligence service was quickly brought into the presence of the German general commanding the city, who said to him point-blank: "I suppose you have come here to accept the surrender of my troops?" The American colonel concealed his surprise and the general then explained the situation: "This is the territory we are occupying (pointing on the map to several hundred square miles centred on Prague), it is completely under our control and we can hand it over to you without difficulty; the Russian troops of General Malinovsky are here (once more pointing on the map to Slovakia, which is a considerable distance from Prague). They are poorly supplied and we can easily hold them for as long as is necessary to complete the formalities of surrender. If you have any doubt about it, I will give you a staff car and you can verify the situation on the spot." The American colonel replied that he was not authorised to negotiate a surrender but that he would go at once to put the matter to General Patton. Then he went at top speed to Pilsen where he made his report to one of Patton's Chiefs of Staff. This officer threw up his hands in horror: "It is more than my life is worth to tell the Boss that. He will blow his top worse than ever. He has just had a rocket from Eisenhower for having overstepped his orders in coming this far."

In other words, the American troops could have occupied Prague and the whole sector offered them by the Germans but General Eisenhower acted in conformity with the Yalta agreement which was secret.

Some days later, the Czechs, who knew that the allied armies were close at hand, rose against the Germans who were still in occupation of the city, and they called to the Americans by radio for help. Patton received this appeal with impotent rage. The Czechs saved Prague from destruction by making an agreement with General Vlassoff whose troops were in the neighbourhood. Vlassoff, who had raised an anti-Communist army under German protection, accepted on condition that the Czechs would guarantee him a free passage for himself and his troops so that he could subsequently surrender to

the Americans. The Czechs kept their promise but, a year later, the Americans handed Vlassoff over to the Soviet forces to be shot.

The German general was right when he said that the troops of General Malinovsky were poorly supplied, for they never got as far as Prague. It was finally General Koniev near Berlin who made the long march from there to Prague, entering the city in triumph as its "liberator". Czecho-Slovakia thus found itself helpless in Soviet hands.

What happened at Prague was repeated at Vienna and Berlin. The allies could have occupied these three cities without difficulty and the only reason why they did not do so was because the cities had been assigned to the Russians, at Yalta.

From the 5th to the 10th February, 1945, the famous meeting between Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill took place at Yalta, in the Crimea, where certain agreements were concluded which put in pawn the future of the world. Almost all the discussions took place between Roosevelt and Stalin. It was Roosevelt who personally and in secret took the Yalta decisions. Without any mandate, without consulting anybody outside his two or three intimate counsellors who were present, without reference to anyone at all, Roosevelt signed agreements of extreme importance which committed the Western World as a whole.

In fact the clauses of the Yalta treaty remained secret for several years and it is only recently that they have come to be known; it is still not sure that they are known completely.

When Patton, as we have seen, learnt about the Yalta agreement while stationed before Prague, he was exceedingly angry, and the American Ambassador to Poland, A. Bliss Lane, was utterly astounded when he learnt that part of the truth which concerned Poland. It is worth quoting his account of it, as related in his memoirs:

"Stettinius and some of his principle advisers . . . were at Yalta. Yet the first word regarding the Conference which reached the State Department in Washington was the report by J. Daniels, Administrative Assistant to the President given out for release on 12th February, 1945. A copy was immediately brought to me at my desk in the State Department. As I glanced over it, I could not believe my eyes. To me, almost every line spoke of a surrender to Stalin... (p. 51)

"By President Roosevelt's own admission, the Yalta agreement with respect to Poland was a compromise. To put it more brutally, it was a capitulation on the part of the United States and Great Britain to the views of the Soviet Union on the frontiers of Poland

and on the composition of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity. Yet at the time the report as a whole was acclaimed by Members of Congress of both parties as an outstanding achievement. The American people hailed it as a definite milestone along the highway of international peace.

" 'At the Yalta Conference the physically disabled President of the United States was outwitted, outmanoeuvred and outfoxed by Stalin', asserts Rozmarek, President of the Polish-American Congress, in a recent letter to me. Immediately after the announcement on 12th February, 1945 of the Yalta decisions, Mr. Rozmarek had stated publicly:

" 'It is with sorrow, dismay and protest that we greet the decisions of the Big Three to give all land east of the so-called Curzon Line to Russia in direct contradiction to all sacred pledges of the Atlantic Charter. This tragic revelation is a staggering blow to the cause of freedom.' (p. 54)

"As for the Poles not subservient to the Kremlin, they had no hesitation in terming the Yalta decision the betrayal of Poland. To them it was the negation of their hopes for independence and for the restoration of the territory which their enemies had confiscated in 1939 in the face of non-aggression treaties. But this time it was not the enemies but the allies of Poland, co-members in the United Nations, who gave the coup de grace to the aspirations of the Polish people for a restoration of their liberty and democracy." (A. Bliss Lane: *I Saw Poland Betrayed*, p. 55)

We will now give a summary of the Yalta agreements. At Yalta, Roosevelt handed over to the Russians:

1. The Baltic countries—Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania;
2. All the eastern part of Poland, which the Russians had occupied in 1939, following the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement;
3. All eastern and central Europe, including Berlin, Prague and Vienna.
4. Access to the Mediterranean through the recognition of Tito as ruler of Yugoslavia, and the abandonment of his rival, the monarchist Mihailovich;
5. Manchuria, ceded to Russia without the knowledge of Chiang Kai-shek, the Chinese republican leader, and in flat contradiction of the undertakings which had been given to the latter at Cairo;
6. Inner Mongolia, North Korea, the Kuril Islands, and the northern part of Sakhalin; in practice, Chiang Kai-shek was sacrificed to Russian ambitions and China was virtually put

within the grasp of the Communists, as subsequent developments were to show;

7. The rights of France in Indo-China were virtually sacrificed, and the origin of the bloody revolutionary war which has engulfed Indo-China can be said to date from these agreements.

8. In addition, on the debit side of Yalta, may be quoted certain clauses such as the following: the Allies engaged themselves to hand over to the Russians all nationals classed as "Soviet citizens", that is, all anti-Communist Russians who had sought refuge in the English, American and French zones, together with all refugees from satellite countries such as Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, etc. . . . This clause led to innumerable personal tragedies; for years afterwards, secret police agents of the N.K.V.D. tracked down Soviet or ex-Soviet nationals even in the heart of Paris.

In the French zone of occupied Germany they soon realised that Russians who were handed over under the clause were likely to suffer deportation or to be shot in the neck; they contrived to hand over as few as possible. The English took longer to understand the truth, but stopped it after a while. The Americans went on for a long while and stopped only after atrocious tragedies had occurred, when their relations with the Soviet had become very strained.

In conclusion, at Yalta, in exchange for definite advantages, Stalin gave only vague and theoretical engagements, which consisted in allowing democratic, free and independent governments to be established in the zone assigned to Russian domination.

Once the Yalta agreement was signed, the Russians demanded and obtained the fulfilment of all the clauses which were favourable to them, but did not observe any of those which they had undertaken to respect.

Bullitt was right when he wrote: "How we won the war and lost the peace". Yalta was a diplomatic disaster such as seldom has been known in history.

How is Roosevelt's attitude at Yalta to be explained?

Various explanations have been given, one as little convincing as another.

The inadequacy of Roosevelt as a negotiator has been attributed to the ignorance and political inexperience of American diplomacy.

It has been suggested that the Allies were scared of the prospect of a separate peace between the Russians and the Germans, of the same sort as the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact, and that they were ready to make any concession to avoid it. This argument does not hold water; too many millions of dead on either side lay between the

Russians and the Germans to allow any possibility of this taking place.

It has been said that, at Yalta, Roosevelt and Hopkins were two moribund figures, physically incapable of defending western interests. It is true that both were very ill when they arrived at Yalta and that they died a few weeks after their return; but the policy of Yalta had been followed by Roosevelt for a long time before the event. Since then a most remarkable document has been published which we shall discuss later: a secret letter from Roosevelt to Zabrinsky, reproduced by Senor Doussinague in his memoirs, published while he was Spanish Ambassador to Chile. He was, at the time of Yalta, principal private secretary to Count Jordana, Foreign Minister of Spain. (See Sr. Doussinague: *Espana tenia razon*, Ed. Espada Calpe, Madrid 1949.) If, as it appears, this document is authentic, the theory of Roosevelt's illness is no explanation and becomes an argument without validity.

William Bullitt and Demaree Bess discuss the question of Roosevelt's responsibility at great length in the two articles already mentioned. The gist of what they have to say is summarised below:
In the course of his article, Bullitt says:

"We had to prove our good faith to Stalin—who had ordered the murder of millions and had broken his word whenever it had suited him to break it . . . this was the topsy-turvy, world-turned-upside down, Alice Through the Looking-Glass attitude towards the Soviet Union which our government adopted in the latter part of 1941.

"Winston Churchill, although he was delighted that our main war effort would be turned against Germany, constantly worried about the consequences of letting the Red Army into Eastern and Central Europe. From time to time he suggested that the British and ourselves should launch a secondary attack through the Balkans or Trieste, so that the Danube Valley might be in our hands and not in the hands of the Communists at the close of the war. Adoption of this project might have saved a large portion of Central and Eastern Europe for the free world. But General Marshall, on the grounds of military logistics, adamantly opposed such an expedition. President Roosevelt supported General Marshall.

"Nevertheless, the President knew that he must find some solution to the problem of Soviet Imperialism—and under the influence of Harry Hopkins, who had become his chief adviser, he adopted a 'solution' which was a supreme example of wishful thinking. The President and Hopkins together evolved a plan to

convert Stalin, by appeasement, from Soviet Imperialism to democratic collaboration.

"The means by which the President hoped to accomplish the conversion of Stalin were four:

"(1) To give Stalin without stint or limit everything he asked for the prosecution of the war and to refrain from asking Stalin for anything in return.

"(2) To persuade Stalin to adhere to statements of general aims, like the Atlantic Charter.

"(3) To let Stalin know that the influence of the White House was being used to encourage American public opinion to take a favourable view of the Soviet government.

"(4) To meet Stalin face to face and to persuade him into an acceptance of Christian ways and democratic principles.

"The President knew that he was gambling with the vital interests of the U.S. He personally approved publication of the statement: 'Mr. Roosevelt, gambling for stakes as enormous as any statesman ever played for, has been betting that the Soviet Union needs peace and is willing to pay for it by collaborating with the West.'

"At the close of a three-hour discussion setting forth my objections to his course, which the President had asked me to prepare, he said: 'Bill, I don't dispute your facts. They are accurate. I don't dispute the logic of your reasoning. I just have a hunch that Stalin is not that kind of a man. Harry says he's not and that he doesn't want anything but security for his country, and I think that if I gave him everything that I possibly can and ask nothing from him in return, noblesse oblige, he won't try to annexe anything and will work with me for a world of democracy and peace.'

"I reminded the President that when he talked of noblesse oblige he was not speaking of the Duke of Norfolk but of a Caucasian bandit whose only thought when he got something for nothing was that the other fellow was an ass, and that Stalin believed in the Communist creed which calls for the conquest of the world for Communism.

"The President then said: ' . . . It's my responsibility, and not yours; and I'm going to play my hunch.'

"After President Roosevelt decided to gamble on his ability to appease Stalin and turn him from Soviet imperialism to democratic collaboration with us, he did everything in his power to please the Soviet dictator.

"The epic bravery of the Red Army and the Russian people had prepared the field for propaganda in favour of the Soviet Government. On this fertile ground the power of the White House was

used to sow a crop of propaganda. Mr. Joseph E. Davies, who had been Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 16th November, 1936 to the spring of 1938, was encouraged to publish a volume entitled *Mission to Moscow* and to act as adviser to the producer of a motion picture with the same title. In his book and film Mr. Davies spread before the American people an alluring picture of the Soviet Union, and made many speeches throughout the U.S. in which his theme was, 'by the testimony of performance and in my opinion the word of honour of the Soviet government is as safe as the Bible.'

"The Department of State employed its influence with Washington correspondents and columnists to add rosy colours to the Soviet picture. All the agents of the Soviet government in America, all the Communists and fellow travellers, joined happily in bamboozling the people of the U.S. with regard to the nature and aims of the Soviet dictatorship.

"The President and Hopkins gradually began to be swept away by the waves of propaganda they had started. In spite of the President's statement of 10th February, 1940, that: 'The Soviet Union is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world', they developed the theory that the Soviet Union was a 'peace-loving democracy' and bestowed favours on persons who subscribed to this perversion of the truth. Able and patriotic officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service who knew the truth about the Soviet Union and refused to lie in favour of the Communist dictatorship were moved to unimportant posts. Clever young men who knew the truth but cared more about their careers than their country and were ready to testify that 'Stalin had changed', were promoted rapidly—and became contemptible profiteers of American disaster. The Department of State, the Treasury Department and many wartime agencies had Soviet partisans poured into them. The War Department began to admit fellow travellers and to allow known Communists to serve as officers with access to confidential information. A network of Soviet sympathisers was established in Washington, and apologists for Soviet policies were sent as American advisers to the Chinese Government and to Latin America. . . .

"It was by his concessions to Stalin's desires in the Far East that the President most gravely endangered the vital interests of the United States. On 30th October, 1943, in Moscow, Stalin had stated to Cordell Hull 'clearly and unequivocally that, when the Allies succeeded in defeating Germany, the Soviet Union would then join in defeating Japan'. In commenting on this statement the Secretary of State wrote, 'The Marshal's statement of his decision

was forthright. He made it emphatically, it was entirely unsolicited, and he asked nothing in return. . . .'

"In November 1943, one month after this promise of Stalin, the President—on his way to Teheran—held a conference in Cairo with Churchill and the Chinese president, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The three signed and published the following declaration: '... that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China.'

"At Yalta on nth February, 1945, President Roosevelt broke the pledge which he had made to the Chinese government at Cairo and—secretly, behind the back of China—signed with Churchill and Stalin an agreement by which ... Roosevelt gave to the Soviet Union not only 'pre-eminent interests' in the great Manchurian port of Dairen and full control of the great naval base which protects it, Port Arthur, but also 'pre-eminent interests' in the railroads which lead from the Soviet Union to Dairen and split Manchuria from the northwest to the south.

"In view of Roosevelt's pledge that Manchuria would be restored to China this secret agreement was entirely dishonourable. It was also potentially disastrous not only to China but also to the United States, because it gave Stalin a deadly instrument for the domination of China and the eventual mobilization of her manpower and resources for war against us. . . .

"The actions of the Soviet government in Poland, Hungary, Austria, Roumania, Bulgaria, Eastern Germany, Iran, Manchuria and Korea during the remaining months of 1945 proved beyond a shadow of doubt that Stalin had remained faithful to Lenin's teaching: 'It is necessary ... to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth.' The President had lost his gamble for 'stakes as enormous as any statesman ever played for.' In truth there had never been a gamble. There was never the slightest possibility of converting Stalin from the creed which calls for the installation of Communist dictatorship in all countries of the world. . . . Roosevelt had not gambled. He had been gulled. . . .

"In the autumn of 1945 General P. J. Hurley, our Ambassador to China, returned to Washington and resigned after stating publicly that his work had been hampered by Communists and fellow travellers in the Department of State and the Foreign Service. To quiet the national scandal which ensued, President Truman asked General Marshall, who had retired, to go to China as his personal representative . . . and to draft his own instructions. . . .

"There are few Americans today who do not understand what result is produced when a national government is forced to enter

into a coalition with Communists. The story has been written in blood and slavery in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. But when General Marshall went to China in December, 1945, cooperation with Communists seemed to him and to President Truman quite a happy thought. ... In his attempts to bend Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to his will, General Marshall used not only arguments but also a form of pressure that was potentially as damaging to the security of the U.S. as it was to the immediate security of China. He cut the military supplies of the Chinese government armies . . . and in the field of aviation, in September 1946, he deliberately broke the contract of the American government to deliver to the Chinese government planes, and spare parts, and ammunition, and materials needed for ground services to maintain 'eight and one-third air groups' for three years. In spite of the mortal peril in which General Marshall's action placed China, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek would not embrace the Communists. He knew what Communists were, and General Marshall did not. President Truman in his ignorance of the Far East blindly followed General Marshall's lead, and our Far Eastern policy became one of the blind leading the blind. This was acutely dangerous . . . since China is the key to the Far East. Communist control of China would lead rapidly to Communist victory in Indo-China . . . which would almost inevitably be followed by Communist subjugation of Thailand (Siam) and the Malay Peninsula.

"Where does that leave us today?

"The present 'peace' is an uneasy armistice which will last only so long as the Soviet Government wants it to last. As in the decade before the First World War, 'Peace is at the mercy of an incident'. And sooner or later the incident will occur.

"Unless something is done, the Continent of Europe and the Far East will fall into Stalin's hands. And the people of the United States will face assault by overwhelming masses of Communist-driven slaves. Once more, as in August 1940 it is necessary to use the tragic words: 'America is in danger. Unless we act now, decisively, to meet the threat we shall be too late. It is clear as anything on this earth that the United States will not go to war, but it is equally clear that war is coming towards the Americas.'

"We face today a struggle not for security but for survival." (Article "How we won the War and lost the Peace", by W. Bullitt, former American Ambassador to Moscow, in *Life*, international edition, 27th September, 1948, pp. 44-52)

The article by Demaree Bess, which appeared in *The Saturday*

Evening Post, on 17th April, 1948, is perhaps even more important than Bullitt's, for it brought to light hitherto unpublished material on the role of Doctor Benes in influencing Roosevelt in his disastrous policy:

"The following account of how President Roosevelt and Doctor Benes worked together in formulating wartime Russian policies was told to me by Doctor Benes himself, in several conversations which I had with him during and since the war. . . .

"The story begins in the spring of 1939, several months before the outbreak of war. The Czech statesman first sought refuge in London, but after a few months he visited the United States . . . and a secret meeting was arranged one week-end at the Roosevelt's Hyde Park home. The two statesmen talked without an interpreter for several hours. Their discussion covered a wide range, but the subject to which the President returned again and again was Soviet Russia, and particularly the personality and character of Josef Stalin. Mr. Roosevelt knew that Doctor Benes was a close student of Russian affairs, and that he was personally acquainted with Stalin. President Roosevelt explained that his own advisers completely disagreed among themselves about Russia and Stalin, and that it was a difficult problem to decide which side was right. The President listened carefully while Doctor Benes outlined his own impressions of the Soviet system. . . .

"Mr. Roosevelt then continued seriously, The chief question in my mind is how to get an agreement with the Russians which will stick. Some of my advisers say that is impossible. They insist that the Russians cannot be trusted to keep any agreement if they see an advantage to themselves in breaking it. What do you think about this?"

"The Czech leader replied confidently, I have given long and careful thought to that matter. I have studied and restudied the actions of the Soviet Government ever since it was founded, and particularly since Stalin rose to power. And it is my considered opinion that if Stalin himself pledges his personal word, then he can be trusted completely."

"The President sat for some moments in silence after hearing this answer. It seemed to make a deep impression upon him. Today, as we piece together the record of the eventful wartime years, it appears that Mr. Roosevelt was wholly convinced by Doctor Benes' conclusion, and that henceforth the President's policy towards Russia was to be based upon his confidence in Stalin's personal word. This explains his intense desire to meet Stalin face to face, first at Teheran and later at Yalta. It may also explain why, the

week before his death, he told Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick of The New York Times, that many Russian actions were disturbing him, but that he still believed in Stalin's good intentions.

"Doctor Benes returned to England when the war broke out, and I had a long talk with him . . . during the first Russo-Finnish war. President Roosevelt had just made a public statement in which he declared, The Soviet Union, as everybody who has the courage to face the fact knows, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world. It has allied itself with another dictatorship, and it has invaded a neighbour (Finland) so infinitesimally small that it could do no conceivable possible harm to the Soviet Union'. . . .

"Doctor Benes admitted to me that this statement distressed him. The Hitler-Stalin pact was then still in force, but Doctor Benes told me he had sent word to the President, through an American intermediary, urging him not to lose faith in Stalin.

"When the break between Hitler and Stalin did come, in the summer of 1941, Doctor Benes was naturally pleased, as were all Allied statesmen. The big question everybody was asking then was, 'How well can the Russians fight?' Mr. Roosevelt sent a personal envoy to get Doctor Benes' opinion. The Czech leader expressed the confident belief that the Russians would never surrender to Hitler, and would remain in the war until the end. He said, 'We must now make our postwar plans upon that assumption.'

"This astute estimate of Russian fortitude, reaching the President at a time when many American military observers were predicting a swift Russian collapse, must have impressed Mr. Roosevelt. Probably he remembered this two years later in the winter of 1943, when Doctor Benes sought our President's support for a projected visit to Moscow to confer with Marshal Stalin. . . .

"President Roosevelt, disregarding Churchill's objections, made it possible for Doctor Benes to visit Moscow. The Czech leader had two long talks with Stalin himself. The result was a treaty of alliance, signed on 12th December. The two countries agreed to combine against any possible future German aggression. Doctor Benes pledged that he would suppress all organized anti-Russian groups in Czechoslovakia after the liberation of that country. Stalin in turn personally guaranteed that Russia would not interfere in Czechoslovakia's postwar development. When the pact was announced in a joint conference, Doctor Benes faced the Russian leader directly and said, 'Mr. Stalin, I have complete confidence in you. We have signed an agreement for non-interference in domestic affairs, and I know you will keep it. . . .'

"Of course, President Roosevelt received full reports of these Czech negotiations in Moscow. They seemed to confirm Doctor Benes' confidence that it was possible to do business with Stalin personally, and they probably re-inforced the President's faith in his own personal understanding with Stalin, reached only a fortnight before at Teheran.

"But Doctor Benes, when I talked with him in Prague after the war, admitted to me that several Czech ministers in London had been gravely disturbed by the Moscow agreement. They said to him, 'You have put yourself at Stalin's mercy'." (And they were proved absolutely right, for Stalin subsequently completely disregarded the agreement of Moscow, and himself brutally dismissed Benes in favour of Gottwald, later seizing the country without striking a blow. Benes died not long afterwards, virtually a prisoner of the Russians, in a residence that was kept under observation—Leon de Poncins.)

However that may be,

"Once the Czecho-Russian treaty was signed, Winston Churchill raised no further objections. Whatever his private doubts, the British statesman had no desire to quarrel with President Roosevelt about the future of Czechoslovakia. He accepted without protest the Czech proposals for the postwar expulsion of their German racial minority, 3,000,000 people. More important still, he concurred in Stalin's suggestion, at the Yalta Conference of the Big Three in February, 1945, that the liberation of Prague should be left to the Red Army."

(Article "Roosevelt's Secret Deal Doomed Czechoslovakia" by Demaree Bess, in *The Saturday Evening Post*, 17th April, 1948)

From all this it appears that, for various reasons, Roosevelt put a personal and blind trust in Stalin. It is indisputable that this trust existed, or at least that Roosevelt consistently acted as if he believed Stalin whole heartedly. The reasons for this confidence are obscure; in as much as Bullitt says that on some occasions Roosevelt did realise Stalin's bad faith. It is sufficient in this context to state the facts and to stress the mysterious nature of the problem without seeking the answer to it.

However, there is another document which sheds further light on the revelations of Bullitt and Demaree Bess, and completes the picture.

In March 1943 the Spanish Government became aware of an extremely important document which boded a grim future for a great number of European countries. It concerned the following secret letter addressed by President Roosevelt on 20th February, 1943 to

Zabrowsky, who was Jewish, and who was then acting as a liaison officer between President Roosevelt and Stalin.

The White House, Washington

Dear Mr. Zabrowsky,

20.2.43

As I have already had the pleasure of telling you, together with Mr. Weiss, I am deeply moved to hear that the National Council of Young Israel has been so extremely kind as to propose me as mediator with our common friend Stalin in these difficult moments, when any menace of friction among the United Nations—in spite of the many self-denying declarations which have been obtained— would have fatal consequences for all, but principally for the U.S.S.R. itself.

It is therefore in your interest and ours to round off the corners — which becomes difficult to bring about with Litvinoff, to whom I have had, very regretfully, to point out that 'those who sought a quarrel with Uncle Sam would get something to complain about', with regard to internal as well as external affairs. For, having regard to Communist activities in the States of the American Union, his claims are absolutely intolerable.

Timoshenko proved more reasonable in his brief but fruitful visit, and indicated that a new interview with Marshal Stalin might constitute a rapid means of arriving at a direct exchange of views. I reckon that this is more and more urgent, particularly when one remembers all the good which has resulted from Churchill's talk with Stalin.

The United States and Great Britain are ready, without any reservations, to give the U.S.S.R. absolute parity and voting rights in the future reorganisation of the post-war world. She will therefore take part (as the English Prime Minister let him know when sending him the first draft from Aden) in the directing group in the heart of the Councils of Europe and of Asia; she has a right to this, not only through her vast intercontinental situation, but above all because of her magnificent struggle against Nazism which will win the praise of History and Civilisation.

It is our intention—I speak on behalf of our great country and of the mighty British Empire—that these continental councils be constituted by the whole of the independent States in each case, with equitable proportional representation.

And you can, my dear Mr. Zabrowsky, assure Stalin that the U.S.S.R. will find herself on a footing of complete equality, having an equal voice with the United States and England in the Direction of the said Councils (of Europe and Asia,). Equally with England and the United States, she will be a member of the High Tribunal

which will be created to resolve differences between the nations, and she will take part similarly and identically in the selection, preparation, armament and command of the international forces which, under the orders of the Continental Council, will keep watch within each State to see that peace is maintained in the spirit worthy of the League of Nations. Thus these inter-State entities and their associated armies will be able to impose their decisions and to make themselves obeyed.

This being the case, a position so elevated in the Tetrarchy of the Universe ought to give Stalin enough satisfaction not to renew claims which are capable of creating insoluble problems for us. In this way, the American continent will remain outside all Soviet influence and within the exclusive concern of the United States, as we have promised the countries of our continent it shall.

In Europe, France will gravitate into the British orbit. We have reserved for France a secretariat with a consultative voice but without voting rights, as a reward for her present resistance and as a penalty for her former weakness.

Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece will develop under the protection of England towards a modern civilisation which will lift them out of their historical decline.

We will grant the U.S.S.R. an access to the Mediterranean; we will accede to her wishes concerning Finland and the Baltic and we shall require Poland to show a judicious attitude of comprehension and compromise; Stalin will still have a wide field for expansion in the little, unenlightened countries of Eastern Europe—always taking into account the rights which are due to the fidelity of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia—and he will completely recover the territories which have been temporarily snatched from Great Russia.

Most important of all: after the partition of the Third Reich and the incorporation of its fragments with other territories to form new nationalities which will have no link with the past, the German threat will conclusively disappear in so far as being any danger to the U.S.S.R., to Europe and to the entire world.

Turkey—but it will serve no useful purpose to discuss that question further, it needs full understanding and Churchill has given the necessary assurances to President Inonu, in the name of us both. The access to the Mediterranean contrived for Stalin ought to content him.

Asia—we are in agreement with his demands, except for any complications which may arise later. As for Africa—again what need for discussion? We must give something back to France and even compensate her for her losses in Asia. It will also be necessary

to give Egypt something, as has already been promised to the Wafdist government. As regards Spain and Portugal, they will have to be recompensed for the renunciations necessary to achieve better universal balance. The United States will also share in the distribution by right of conquest and they will be obliged to claim some points which are vital for their zone of influence; that is only fair. Brazil, too, must be given the small colonial expansion which has been offered to her.

In view of the rapid annihilation of the Reich, convince Stalin— my dear Mr. Zabrowsky—that he ought to give way, for the good of all, in the matter of the colonies in Africa, and to abandon all propaganda and intervention in the industrial centres of America. Assure him also of my complete understanding and of my entire sympathy and desire to facilitate these solutions, which makes more timely than ever the personal discussion which I propose— the above is only a general outline of a plan which is intended for further study.

This is the issue and the whole issue.

As I told you at the time, I was very pleased at the gracious terms of the letter informing me of your decision and of the desire you expressed to offer me in the name of the National Council a copy of the greatest treasure of Israel, the scroll of the Torah. This letter will convey the confirmation of my acceptance; to those who are frank with me, I respond with the greatest confidence. Be so good, I beg of you, to transmit my gratitude to the distinguished body over which you preside, recalling the happy occasion of the banquet on its 31st anniversary.

I wish you every success in your work as interpreter.

Very sincerely yours, (signed) Franklin Roosevelt.

This letter (which has been translated from a French version) is reproduced in Senor Doussinague's book, written when he was Spanish Ambassador, entitled *Espana Tenia Razon* (pp. 198-199). In it, he explains Spain's attitude to Soviet Communism, to the Axis powers and to the Allies during the various stages of the war. During this period, Senor Doussinague was the assistant of Count Jordana, Foreign Minister of Spain. He was therefore directly concerned with the events whose history he describes, and of which his book is firsthand evidence. He makes the following comments on the Roosevelt letter:

"So, by the benevolent resolve of Mr. Roosevelt, who was then preparing for the Teheran conference in full agreement with Stalin, Central Europe, with the exception of Turkey and Greece—

though the latter was to be deprived of Thrace in order to give the U.S.S.R. free access to the Mediterranean—the Baltic countries, and certain countries of Western Europe such as Holland, Belgium and Switzerland, were to come under Soviet domination; Germany was to be dismembered; while the Asiatic continent, including the French colonies, would also enter the Soviet sphere. In Africa certain promises were made to Stalin. As the counter part to this, in Western Europe, Italy, France, Spain and Portugal were to pass under the protection of England. America would remain entirely outside the influence and propaganda of the Soviets.

"But what is more, the U.S.S.R. would take a hand in the choice and preparation of international forces which were to be active within all European States, including those of the West; and the Asian States, constituted as the Council of Asia, and the European States, constituted as the Council of Europe, were to be directed by a group comprising the United States, the U.S.S.R., England and China, on a footing of complete equality, in complete disregard of the right to independence possessed by each of the countries so disposed of, and also of all that was representative of Christian civilisation in the Continent of Europe.

"Spain, together with all the other European countries, would be subject to this directory body of which her worst enemy would be a member—the same enemy which had led the fight against us throughout the Civil War, and which could never forgive Spain for the defeat that had been inflicted on it under the guidance of General Franco.

"A mere glance at this letter is enough to explain the amazement, the agitation and the fear we felt when we became aware of it. Our ardent desire to see peace come with all speed, before President Roosevelt's plans could be realised, can easily be imagined. Knowledge of this letter was the key to all the actions and gestures of Spain and served as a basis for the political discussions of its rulers. Thanks to this letter we knew what to expect of the postwar period ... an immense catastrophe threatened to descend on Europe and on all its old civilisation."

It seems an extraordinary thing that this document, reproduced in a book of an official character, written by a diplomat who had been the secretary of Count Jordana, and placed publicly on sale in Madrid, it seems—I say—extraordinary that this document should have remained practically unknown outside Spain.

The Spanish government has not divulged its source, nor in its place, would any other government have done so. All we know is that it was a feminine personality in the immediate circle around

Roosevelt, who secretly communicated this document to the Spanish Government.

The Spanish government was absolutely certain of its authenticity, since their policy and the speeches of their rulers have been profoundly influenced by it; furthermore, it is an undeniable fact that the agreements reached at Teheran and Yalta were in conformity with the lines indicated in this famous letter.

I have personally questioned the author of the book, Senor Doussinague, who granted me an interview when he was Ambassador at Rome. Naturally he did not reveal any diplomatic secrets, but he made the following very judicious remarks:

"The authenticity of the document is apparent merely from its context. Carry yourself back to the time with which it deals; who was there among us—unless it were some prophet, who would have been accused of being out of his mind—who could have imagined in advance that Roosevelt, acting in his personal capacity, was about to hand over half of Europe and Asia to the Soviets, secretly and without gaining anything in return?"

The reader must form his own opinion, but we would observe that a number of conclusions may be drawn from this document:

1. There have been attempts to excuse Roosevelt on the score that at Yalta he was a dying man unable to defend himself in the conduct of the negotiations. The letter to Zabrowsky, on the contrary, proves that the Yalta agreement had been prepared far in advance by a secret understanding between Roosevelt and Stalin.
2. There were certain Jews, such as Zabrowsky, and Freemasons, such as Benes, who served as intermediaries between Roosevelt and Stalin; this confirms the enormous influence which the Jewish and Masonic advisers of his immediate circle exerted over Roosevelt, and their Communist tendencies.
3. Jewish circles therefore bear a heavy responsibility for the disastrous treaty of Yalta and for the seizures made by the Soviet in Europe and Asia.
4. This does not relieve Roosevelt in any way of his personal responsibility. His lack of awareness of what he was doing and his failure to comprehend Stalin's Communism remain utterly amazing. There are only two possible explanations for his attitude: either he was truly ignorant, to an astonishing degree for a politician normally so astute: or he was a conscious agent of subversion, entirely dominated by the Jewish influences around him.

TWENTIETH-CENTURY FREEMASONRY

THE victory of the Allies in 1918 was also a triumph for Freemasonry, for it had prepared the bases of the treaty of Versailles and presided over the creation of the League of Nations in the course of a secret congress of the Masonic members of allied and neutral nations held at the Grand Orient of Paris on 28th, 29th and 30th June, 1917 (see Chapter 3). Freemasonry inspired and dominated most of the democratic Governments of the new Europe which had succeeded the monarchies overthrown by the defeat of the Central Powers.

Benes, who was the sectarian and activating soul of Freemasonry in Central Europe, solidly supported by the U.S.A. held unopposed sway over the Little Entente (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania) and lost no opportunity of showing his sympathies for Soviet Russia. Freemasonry was the reigning power in France from 1918 to 1939.

The Order promised the world an era of peace, happiness and prosperity but after the war there rapidly supervened disorder and financial breakdown, revolution and universal chaos.

In Germany, Hungary and Italy, Bolshevism was eventually strangled at the cost of great efforts and much blood-shed.

In Austria, Socialism brought about the ruin of the country. Everywhere Masonic democracy, which as we have seen, is an admirable instrument for the disruption of order, showed that when in power it was incapable of governing and maintaining order itself. As a more or less general reaction, authoritarian regimes sprang up by popular consent, for example those of Admiral Horthy in Hungary, Mussolini and Fascism in Italy, Chancellor Dollfuss in Austria, Hitler and National Socialism in Germany. Traditional monarchies had been suppressed in favour of democratic regimes; but everywhere dictators more despotic than former sovereigns came into power. Freemasonry, thinking herself mistress of the future, found that she had fallen on difficult times.

In France three great events which marked a turning point in the history of the Third Republic, had profound repercussions on the politics of the country: the Cartel des Gauches in 1924, the Stavisky

affair in 1934 and the Popular Front in 1936. Parallel to this chain of events in the outside world came Hitler's rise to power in Germany, the Spanish civil war, and finally the Second World War.

Let us first turn to the affair of the Cartel des Gauches in 1924. The 1924 elections brought into power a coalition of left-wing elements which, under the leadership of Herriot, pushed through a long string of Socialist laws of Masonic inspiration and Marxist tendencies. A complete account of their elaboration and origin is to be found in Chapter 3. As to their effect, suffice it to say that in 1925, Poincare was recalled to power and achieved a spectacular restoration of the currency: the first attempt at a Masonic Socialist government had proved an ignominious failure.

But a new crisis arose over the Stavisky affair of such dimensions that the democratic republican regime was profoundly shaken by it. Let us briefly summarise the facts:

Alexander Stavisky, of Russian Jewish origin, had swindled an official State organisation out of several hundred millions of francs. Important political personalities were directly involved; quite incredible details were soon brought to light; Stavisky, it appeared, was a friend of radical Socialist politicians and gave huge sums of money to the Party and even to some of its members; he had partly financed the election of the Radical party in 1932; in exchange he enjoyed the protection of high government circles, which assured him of impunity. Publicly indicted, he was found guilty and condemned nineteen times, and nineteen times he was let off again through the intervention of his illustrious protectors.

There was an explosion of indignation in Paris. As the government was obviously trying to stifle the affair in order to protect the politicians who were implicated, outbursts of protest took place in the streets. These were violently suppressed by the police, which had the effect of pouring fuel on the flames. Parliament was unable to sit without the protection of an enormous deployment of police forces.

In the midst of all this a new bombshell exploded. Stavisky, who had disappeared as soon as the affair became a scandal, had just been found by the police at Chamonix; his house was surrounded and he committed suicide just as he was about to be arrested. There were no witnesses except the police and a man named Voix, an informer, known to the police and friend of Stavisky.

There were stormy scenes in the Chamber and certain deputies, Ybarnegaray among others publicly accused the police of having executed Stavisky to stop him talking.

Violent riots took place in the evening of 28th January, and in the face of the strong popular reaction, the government felt obliged to resign. A new team of young ministers took office but ran into

more and more violent opposition. The national organisations and ex-soldiers' associations organised a mass meeting for the evening of 6th February, a date which will remain forever historic. All the police forces, gendarmes and mounted police available had been mobilised. There was a veritable night of civil war, in the course of which the police fired point blank on a dense crowd; thirty people were killed and two thousand wounded; all the Paris hospitals were full. The crisis was so serious that the President of the Municipal Council and the President of the Republic telephoned the former President, Doumergue, then in retirement on his estate in the Midi, and asked him to form a cabinet of National Union, including ministers belonging to all the principal parties. The regime was saved by the skin of its teeth, but the affair did not end there and was to have far reaching consequences.

Trotsky, who at that time had secretly taken refuge in France, pronounced the following judgment, which the future was to bear out. The agony of democracy in France, he said, may well endure longer than the Bruning-Papen Schleicher pre-Fascist period in Germany, but for all that it would not cease to be an agony. Democracy would be swept away, and the question was simply who was to wield the broom.

The Socialist and Communist papers then openly proclaimed that it was a race between them and Fascism, and the appearance, on 12th February of a huge Communist Manifesto in the Paris district revealed the collusion between Socialism and Freemasonry.

The Stavisky affair brought home to everyone the power and the danger which a secret association like Freemasonry represented in French politics. It let loose a vast Press campaign against the Masons which did not let up until the war and finally led to the banning of the sect under Marshal Petain's government.

The *Revue des Deux Mondes*, a very staid organ of moderate opinion which certainly could not be accused of political extremism, voiced popular sentiment very fairly in an article from which we have taken the following passages:

"Stavisky seems to have been the head of a gang, a Mafia, as the Minister of the Interior Albert Sarraut described it . . . which was not only practising swindling on a grand scale, but also espionage and corruption. At the bottom of the affair we shall find an undertaking aiming at the breakdown of French power.

"But this gang was protected by powerful politicians and, through their intervention, profited from the indulgent tolerance of senior judges whose duty it was to punish their crimes."

On 21st February, the body of one of these judges, M. Prince,

was found on the railway line at Dijon. It had been cut to pieces by a train. The autopsy revealed that he had been anaesthetized and tied to the rails while still alive and that his body had been shattered by an express train.

He was the man who knew most about the Stavisky affair, and the very next day he was due to hand in his report to M. Lescouve, the first President of the Court of Appeal. The assassins were never discovered.

"This audacious crime", the *Revue des Deux Mondes* went on, "was cleverly premeditated and organised, and has sent a shudder of horror and consternation throughout France; public opinion, on the side of justice, clamours for light on the matter which the government hopes to be able to bring it.

"If the assassination is the deed of the Stavisky gang, who can tell what power and organisation it must possess? And what crimes as yet unknown has it to conceal? If it is a political or a Masonic crime, what high ranking personalities can be glimpsed behind it? Is the collusion between politics and brigandage, so rife in America, about to be acclimatised in our own contaminated country? So long as the truth remains unknown and the guilty go unpunished, a frightful nightmare will continue to weigh down the conscience of France.

"More and more we are receiving the impression that what we are witnessing is only the dance of puppets whose guiding strings remain hidden. Are attempts being made to form a new Ministry following the dictates of some hidden power?

"We, however, have to take what comes to us, being only powerless and bewildered spectators.

"This impression of mystery which hangs over us, this feeling of shady goings on and tortuous connections lurking in the shadow, is what makes the atmosphere at present so heavy and painful. It is to be hoped that the Ministry of National Union and its spirit of devotion to the country will free us from it. Like the ancient historian at the threshold of an era of reform, we shall breathe a sigh of deliverance. Turn demum respirare coepimus—then only shall we begin to breath."

(*Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15th March, 1934)

Finally, under the threat of the rise to power of Right wing elements, the three great Left wing parties, the Communists, the Socialists and the Radical-Socialists, united in a common front, known as *Le Front Populaire*. This alliance was made under the aegis of Freemasonry. The League for the Rights of Man, under the leader-

ship of Victor Basch and Emile Kahn, played a preponderant part in this union of Left wing parties.

In June 1936, Leon Blum formed a cabinet to combat the Fascists. This included a number of Jewish officials and a dozen ministers and under secretaries who were Masons, Camille Chautemps, Maurice Viollette, Marc Rucart, Roger Salengro, Jean Zay, Paul Bastid, Georges Monnet, Raoul Aubaud, F. Blanch, P. Ramadier, etc. . . . Immediately Blum initiated a vast complex of Socialist laws, thus provoking a series of extremely grave social troubles, with the inevitable repercussion of a new and spectacular failure of the franc, which seriously weakened the government.

On the eve of war, European Freemasonry was in complete confusion. In 1918 it thought it was on the eve of universal triumph; and now it suddenly felt the soil giving way under its feet in every direction at once—whether political, social, economic or religious.

". . . So long as democracy remained confined in the lodges, so long as it was only a talking point, it could cast a deceptive spell. The mystical Masons believed that they could construct a viable regime. . . . But Masonry was put to the test. It wielded power, and what was the result?

"It held sway in Russia with Kerensky, and in Italy under Giolitti and Nitti; it had a hand in the Labour Government of Henderson and Ramsay MacDonald in England; it had a short lived triumph in Germany under the Social Democratic Party with the complicity of Bruning; it is now ruling in Spain with Largo Caballero, Indalecio Prieto, Rodolpho Llopis and Alexandre Leroux; it still rules France. . . .

"But everywhere without exception the test of the power it has wielded has proved a baneful experience. . . .

"Masonry is beginning to realise that its democratic ideology leaves it bankrupt and that it will not provide it with the least guidance on how to resolve the political conflicts that confront it. It knows this and admits it."

(Text of the speech by P. Loyer at a public conference in Paris)

The most clear-sighted of the Masons were able to recognise that there was disorder, but, prisoners of their own ideology, they were unable to grasp the cause of their failure, least of all to find the remedy to the situation, and so they clung in desperation to their out-dated concepts.

"The unrest is universal in time and space", wrote the Freemason Paul Bezault, in the Bulletin of the Grand Lodge of France on 1st August, 1932.

"Amidst the slaughter of the political, social and religious forms of a conservative way of life, the modern Frenchman is still seeking a way out.

"He wants to find a direction, to put an end to his aimless existence. . . .

"The metaphysical absolute is once more gnawing at the French soul. . . .

"The need for an absolute, the need to know with certainty whether the metaphysical ideal exists outside us, or within, as an immanent value of the world, the need to know about things beyond the tomb, all this is yet another aspect of the unrest of contemporary France.. ..

"This need for an absolute is in reality only the undertow of religious sentimentality, which returns periodically in every disturbed epoch and at moments of intellectual and moral strife to shake the ship of faith in which timid consciences take refuge, since they are never masters of themselves; it is their subscription against the contingent risks of the beyond, their insurance policy for immortal happiness.

"How can this need for an absolute be cured? It is an artificial need, which has influence only in proportion to our intellectual and moral weakness, and to our metaphysical desire to shore up by science what can never be proved.

"Masonry, together with other independent minds, replies by exerting itself to lead individual and social morality back to its natural sources . . . but the ascendancy of religious sentimentality remains, and it has even increased since the (First) war.

"As against this sentimentality, which it would be vain to underestimate in its activity, and dangerous to clash with until it has been taught to come down from the turbulent regions in which it persists in soaring, as against this there stands the whole work of Masonry, not in political antithesis, and still less as a method of combat, but as a constructive theory designed to reorganise the human conscience.

"To secularize the constitution of a people is but a small thing, but to secularize the soul of that people is better....

"The recasting of a better kind of humanity, more sure of itself and its aim, and better endowed with a sense of responsibility and truth, calls for all the efforts of complete and integral secularism, whose principles, scattered on the dissolving waves of political struggles, have not yet found the synthetic formula which will weld them into a doctrine capable of achieving true renovation— a secularism whose apostles, ceasing at least to appear as the demolishers of the past, will restore the values of an objective

philosophy and morality, without which the most ethereal system of metaphysics cannot exist, except by throwing men and societies into the indescribable chaos over which we have been called to brood."

What does Freemasonry propose as a remedy for the spiritual chaos in which the world is struggling? Nothing less than the complete and integral reign of secularism! What a sterile and wretched solution. How dessicating and negative. As if one can cure the effects of a poison by administering a massive dose of the same venom.

Comes the ominous years 1939-40, which saw the outbreak of war, the defeat of France, first Europe and then the world set alight, the collapse of the republican regime in France, the German occupation and the government of Marshal Petain.

In his works Mellor describes the abominations perpetrated against the Freemasons during the occupation in France. This is in fact what happened.

On 13 th August, 1940, the Minister of Justice, Raphael Alibert, and the Minister of the Interior, Adrien Marquet, delivered the following report to Marshal Petain:

"Monsieur le Marechal,

"There are in existence in France organisations of an occult character which have been founded or developed either as formal associations or as mere groups which happen to have come into being.

"No government can allow the existence of groups pursuing a clandestine or secret activity, least of all in present-day circumstances.

"It is totally inadmissible that the enterprise which has been undertaken with a view to national reform should be opposed by organisations which are all the more dangerous because they remain concealed, because they recruit a great number of their members amongst the Civil Service, and because their activities too often tend to disrupt the machinery of the State and paralyse the actions of the Government.

"Thus it would appear to be necessary, on the one hand, to dissolve all groups and associations which are secret in character and to prohibit their reconstitution; and on the other hand to require from all those who exercise a public function, an honourable undertaking that they do not belong and will never belong to such an organisation.

"This is the object of the law which we have the honour to submit for your distinguished approval."

On the same day, the Marshal promulgated a law decreeing the dissolution of Freemasonry, the first three articles of which are set out below:

"We, Marshal of France, Head of State; having taken counsel from our ministers,

"Decree:

"Article I

"Dating from the promulgation of the present law, the bodies mentioned below are dissolved without exception:

"(1) Every association and group in existence whose activities are carried on even partially in a secret or clandestine manner;

"(2) Every association and group in existence whose members impose on themselves the obligation to conceal from public authority, even partially, the nature of their activity;

"(3) Every association and group in existence which refuses or neglects to make known to public authority, after being required to do so, its statutes and regulations, its interior organisation, its hierarchy, the list of its members with the positions which they occupy, the object of its meetings, or which intentionally provides false or incomplete information on these subjects.

"Article II

"The nullity of groups or associations falling under the scope of the preceding article is to be established by decree.

"Article III

"The movable and immovable property of associations and groups dissolved in virtue of the preceding article will, at the request of the public ministry, be confiscated by order of the president of the civil tribunal of the place where they are situated.

"Steps will be taken to liquidate them under the authority of the president of the civil tribunal and under supervision of the public ministry.

"The sums produced by the liquidation will be handed over, in Paris, to the general administration of public assistance, and in other localities to the welfare office of the commune concerned."

Article V decreed:

"No one can become a civil servant or an agent of the State, or of the local Departments or public establishments, colonies, protectorates or territories under French mandate; no one can be employed by a concessionary of the public service or in an enterprise financially assisted by the State or by one of the public bodies afore-mentioned:

"(1) If he does not declare, on his honour, that he has never

belonged to one of the organisations defined in Article I, or that he has broken all connections with it.

"(2) If he does not pledge himself, on his honour, never to adhere to such an organisation, in case it should ever be reconstituted.

"The declaration and pledge mentioned in the present article are to be certified by written documents.

"Whoever shall have made a false declaration shall be dismissed from his office and punished with the penalties mentioned in Article IV."

(Published at the time in *Le Journal Officiel*, and reproduced in "*La Republique du Grand Orient*", a special issue of *Lectures Francoises*, 5th January, 1964)

In practice the anti-Masonic measures were applied with very great leniency. Civil servants who said that they had been Freemasons were not disturbed and continued to occupy their positions in complete tranquillity; those who were convicted of false declarations were theoretically compelled to resign but in fact very few measures of that kind were taken by Vichy.

Besides, the government did not possess official lists of Masons, since membership of Masonry was kept secret; the only means of drawing up lists was to study systematically the documents seized in the lodges. But this task was only slowly and tardily organised. The sites of the lodges had been confiscated, but that was as far as things went. Before any action happened, there was an announcement that anti-Masonic measures were going to be taken, which gave the sect time to put its most essential archives into hiding. It had not waited for the defeat of France to do so and some weeks before the Armistice important documents had been sent to Bordeaux.

Eventually, a study and research group was set up under the direction of Bernard Fay, Professor of the College of France and a historian of Masonry in the eighteenth century, the naval Captain Labat, Colonel de Vercheres and several anti-Masonic workers of the prewar period, such as Robert Valery-Radot, Henri Coston, J. Marques-Riviere, an ex-Mason, Georges Olivier, an assistant on Mgr. Jouin's *Revue Internationale des Societes Secretes*, etc. This team was installed in the premises of the Grand Orient and the Grand Lodge at Paris, it made a systematic study of the documents which had been seized, and published the results of its researches in a review entitled *Les Documents Maconniques*.

But when Laval came to power there was a radical change in the government's attitude: Laval set himself up as the protector of Freemasonry and rapidly put an end to all the measures directed against

the secret societies, in spite of the tenacious opposition of Admiral Platon, a firm Protestant animated by a lively sense of national duty and the only member of the government to take the Masonic question seriously. He was to pay with his life for that attitude.

In a recently published and well documented book, *La Republique du Grand Orient*, Henri Coston (who spent several years in prison after the Liberation) gives us a very clear account of what happened during the occupation. Speaking of Laval, he says:

"Nothing could have been more significant than to watch him step by step bringing to naught the anti-Masonic legislation. He was careful not to destroy it, for that would have caused too much noise. He steadily and surely whittled it away. From 19th August, 1942, he attached the services of the secret societies to the Surete Nationale, the state intelligence service."

(H. Coston: *La Republique du Grand Orient*, p. 219)

He took a series of measures in this direction.

"Platon was not put in the picture; he complained vehemently, and Laval soon afterwards got rid of him. ... A circular directed the ministries to reopen in a sympathetic vein the dossiers of officials who had been put out of office. '19 out of 20 of the officials who had been dismissed were reinstated', Maurice Reclus declares. 'No one who had made a false declaration was prosecuted'.

"Laval was so little anti-Masonic that he had until January 1941 a secretary, Roger Stora, who was a Mason, whom he afterwards appointed as special Receiver of Taxes at Grasse. ... He arranged for a friend of the latter, the high official Moatti, who fell under the provisions of the law on secret societies, to continue to draw his salary although he had had to give up his position in the Central Administration. He also retained as long as he could, the Masonic Prefects whom the Marshal's cabinet had indicated as undesirables. On the other hand, he displaced prefects and sub-prefects considered to be too favourably disposed to the 'national revolution', and he came down vigorously on 'national revolutionaries' who were convinced anti-Masons and who objected too openly against his policy.

"It was also Pierre Laval who had the secret societies police suppressed by Rene Bousquet, secretary general of the Ministry of the Interior (now director of the Bank of Indo China) and a protege of Sarraut, whom the president had made a deputy minister of the French State.

(H. Coston, *ibid.*, pp. 220-221)

"At last to put an end to Platon's opposition (Mallet and

Bousquet in their evidence made him out to be a rabid anti-Mason, which the cold and austere Platon certainly was not) Pierre Laval had the Admiral placed under house arrest in his estate at Pujol-en-Dordogne. But if the guard was sufficient to prevent Platon from leaving his house, it was clearly insufficient to keep out the Dordogne maquis. The former minister was carried off by the F.F.O. tortured and killed.

"But it was at the German Embassy in Paris that the Masons, however little they called themselves 'Europeans', found the best and most efficacious protection. . . .

"Those who lived in political circles in Paris during 1940-44 will know that the Embassy was the worst enemy of the Petainists and the 'national revolutionaries'. . . .

"On the other hand one remembers that the Communist newspaper *Humanite* only just failed to reappear in 1940. For the Communists had obtained the necessary authority from the Germans, and it was the French police service which intervened—on the authority of the laws and decrees of the Daladier government—and stifled that attempt before it was hatched. . . .

"The tolerance enjoyed by former Masons in the occupied zone, who were pursued by the Marshal's cabinet, however small was the political role they appeared to be playing, is largely explained by the tendency to favour left wing influence which was displayed by the German Embassy in Paris. (H. Coston, *ibid.*, pp. 222-224)

"But it must also be recognised that the charm shown by the Germans accounted for much in rallying many Freemasons in support of the policy of Franco-German collaboration, as Weil-Curiel had admitted.

"For certain men of the left, Abetz, the German ambassador, was a proven Francophile and a sincere partisan of the reconciliation of the two peoples. They were seduced by this man, who never spoke to them about National-Socialism, but only of European Socialism, and who showed himself so favourable to the French Republic. Numerous Masons were active in collaborating with the Germans but it should be recognised that some of them were definitely anti-Communist.

"The tendencies of ambassador Abetz and also, doubtless, the anti-clerical sentiments of the occupying authorities, who were not displeased at stirring up an opposition to the 'Vichy reactionaries'—accordingly allowed certain Masons to indulge in important political activities. For the most part they remained faithful to their Masonic ideal and this explains their intervention.

"It is also a fact, little known but true, that the Germans were

never whole-hearted opponents of Freemasonry, for as Dr. Helmut Knochen, Chief of Staff of the S.S. at Paris during the occupation, declared: 'Berlin hardly insisted on anything concerning the Masonic question'. He remarks elsewhere that 'on the German side, there was no special commissioner (for the secret societies) as there was for the Jewish question, the latter being in receipt of continual directives from Berlin'.
(H. Coston, *ibid.*, p. 227)

"In actual fact, there was an Obersturm-fuhrer named Stubert, under Knochen's orders, whose duty was to carry out research into Masonic documents in so far as they were directly of interest to Germany, and to control the police service dependent on the Prefecture, which was installed at Rapp square, in the building belonging to the Theosophical Society, under the direction of Inspector Moerschel. . . .

"The German occupation authorities—whether Ambassador Abetz, counsellor Achenbach, or Knochen—were not then hostile to Freemasons; far from it, in fact. But were the leading National Socialists in Germany any more so? . . ."

(H. Coston, *ibid.*, p. 227)

From the time of his arrival to power in Algeria, General de Gaulle, who governed then with Communist support, re-established the Masonic organisations with all their prerogatives and gave back to the Jews the same positions they had held before the war. As an example of his use of Communist support, when the de Gaulle government installed itself in Paris, Maurice Thorez, Secretary General of the Communist Party, who deserted in 1939 and took refuge in Russia, was appointed Minister of State, while General Weygand, who had been liberated from a deportation camp, was incarcerated in a Parisian prison.

The Liberation of France was followed by the epuration, or purge of the French "collaborators". Few people outside France know how murderous this was: more than 100,000 Frenchmen were assassinated without trial, and this figure was admitted by the former Minister of the Interior, Adrien Texier, in a conversation in February 1945 with Colonel Passy, the head of General de Gaulle's D.G.E.R., or secret service. Robert Aron, in his history of the purge, estimates that some 40,000 people fell victim to the summary executions of the *maquis*.

The repression was particularly severe towards writers and anti-Masons. Here, as far as the latter are concerned, is a brief resume of what Henri Coston says in his book from which we have just quoted:

"Henri Beraud was condemned to death for the articles he wrote in *Gringoire*. The prosecutor, the future President Raymond Lindon, who demanded the capital sentence against the great writer, may not have been a Mason, but the presiding judge of the Court of Justice, who sentenced Beraud, certainly was. Happily he was not executed, but five years later he came out of prison in a wheeled chair.

"Bernard Fay and his collaborators and friends were tried on three different counts. The professor was condemned to hard labour for life, as were two other anti-Masons, another was condemned to twenty years, two to fifteen years, several to ten and five years, and many were sentenced to national degradation.

"The detective in charge of the inquiry, Superintendent Paul Sertillange, was a member of the Socialist Workers Lodge, and the judge who drew up their dossier, Alexis Zousmann, was one of the most brilliant and ruthless of the magistrates involved in the epuration—a recently liberated prisoner-of-war who had been a member of the Francisco Ferrer lodge before the war. He it was who had drafted the charges against the journalists P. A. Cousteau and Lucien Rebatet, who had been condemned to death some months previously.

(Alexis Zousmann, a Jewish emigre from Russia who became a naturalised Frenchman before the last war, today occupies an important position on the Magistrates' Bench, and presides over the Masonic group, Condorcet-Brossellette. Recently he was responsible for repressing the Algerian O.A.S.—Leon de Poncins.)

"Three of the men who served in the secret societies service died in prison: Commander Labat was killed by a warder, Colonel de Vercheres died in a forced-labour camp, and Paul Lafitte died at the hospital of Fresnes. A fourth, H. Babize, who remained four years in prison, died several years afterwards from an intestinal disease contracted during his detention. The former Freemason Paul Riche, against whom so much hatred had accumulated, was condemned to death and shot. Another ex-Mason, Albert Vigneau, who had left the Order in 1934 after the Stavisky affair, and who had written several books against the lodges, died in prison. Jean Boissel, an anti-Mason who had been severely disabled in the war, met with the same fate." (H. Coston, *ibid.*, p. 239)

Meanwhile, Philippe Poirson, who was the head of the anti-Masonic service established at the rue Cadet during the occupation, had been arrested by the Germans and died during deportation.

Robert Vallery-Radot and Jean Marques-Riviere disappeared at the time of the Liberation. The latter has not been heard of since, and

Vallery-Radot apparently died recently after taking Holy Orders. Having dropped out of circulation, he had escaped a judicial pursuit.

"Those who were at last liberated after a long detention were left without resources on being released from prison, without a position in life, without employment, often without a home; and their health, sapped by years in gaol, was never completely restored. Too many people are unaware that the epuration which took place in 1944 struck down 400,000 of Petain's supporters."

(H. Coston, *ibid.*, p. 239)

We come now to the conclusion of this study, in which we have attempted to show, by reference to documents of unimpeachable authority, that Freemasonry as a system is fundamentally hostile to the whole civilisation, culture and way of life of Western Europe, which was created by and founded upon Christianity, and which, until recently, was deeply impregnated with Christian history, traditions and morality. We have traced the development and the various forms and expressions of Freemasonry up to the present day, and it now remains to ask where Freemasonry stands in Europe today.

Following the upheavals which, as we have seen, began in the First World War and preceded and followed the Second, Freemasonry has lost much of its prestige and preponderance in Europe.

The check to its domination after 1918 has left a profound mark upon it. It has been unmasked and has lost a great deal of its prestige. It has been banned and so remains in many countries under various political regimes. Its adversaries have discovered its subversive techniques, its methods of infiltration and political penetration, and they have learned how to combat them.

Its recruitment has dried up for some years and on the whole it is not supported by the younger generation. It is not finding it easy to build up its ranks.

It has lost its position as the intellectual leader of left-wing parties to the Communists, synarchist technocrats (a French secret society of leading engineers, industrialists and business men) and progressive Christians.

On the other hand, its methods of insidious penetration have enabled it to infiltrate into the Church, where it finds powerful support in progressive circles. Being essentially chameleon-like and infinitely variable in form, it is reconstituting itself on new foundations to become an international force once more, adapted to the new political environment. The subversive movements today consider that burrowing inwardly is more efficacious than open, bloody revolution.

APPENDIX

PAX AND POLAND

WHILE not directly related to the subject of this book, the Report on Pax prepared by Cardinal Wyszyński is of such vital interest and seems to be so little known in the English-speaking world that this Appendix, describing the background of the movement and quoting in full the text of the Cardinal's Report on Pax, was drawn up by the translator with the agreement of the author. Moreover it will become clear to the reader that this document is not unrelated to the subject of the book as a whole, since it exposes a very determined attempt by the Soviet secret police to destroy the Church in Poland by seeking to penetrate and subvert it from within, frontal coercion and force having been completely defeated by the faith of the people. We have seen in earlier chapters in the present work how Freemasonry failed to impose itself on the nations by force and how, in consequence, and especially since the Second World War, it has resorted to subversion from within. The interest of the document we are about to lay before the reader is that it presents a particularly clear and recent instance of Communism's like failure to eradicate faith by force, and of its resorting to similar tactics to achieve its ends.

Before we quote the text of the Cardinal's letter, it will be useful to give the reader the background to this organisation which was set up in Poland by the Soviet political police, to infiltrate the Church with Communist cells and impregnate it with Marxism. Originally a Polish party, Pax spread throughout the countries of Western Europe and took root principally in France. The following information is taken from Lucjan Blit: *The Eastern Pretender*, a biography of Bolesław Piasecki, the founder of Pax, and one of the most remarkable men behind the Iron Curtain.

In 1946 Piasecki and a number of progressive Catholics set themselves up as a group which published a weekly *Today and Tomorrow* and talked vaguely about marching with the times and being realistic, by which they meant that any political regime in Poland would have to be acceptable to Moscow. The majority of Catholics viewed these moves with suspicion, and it came as no great surprise when in March 1947 the Polish Primate, the late Cardinal Hlond, stated that Piasecki's daily *Universal Voice* could not be considered representative of the Catholic community.

Shortly after his installation as Primate of Poland, Cardinal Wyszyński, in a pastoral letter, warned all believers of the activities

and aims of Piasecki's Pax and the progressive Catholics whom he described as "traitors to the Catholic Church". On 12th February, 1950, the Cardinal said that they were lacking in Catholic sense and learning, and yet they wanted to teach the bishops; furthermore, he rejected their claim to publish genuine Catholic works while at the same time attacking the Holy See, and he explicitly condemned them for assisting the Communist regime in the destruction of Catholic organisations.

"As soon as the party and state went over to an open attack on the hierarchy Pax gave full support to all the actions, political, moral and even of a police nature, which the regime adopted against the Church. Not once during the whole period of brutal repressions between 1948 and October 1956 did Pax, or the progressive Catholics, or Piasecki himself, as much as whisper any criticism. They were not even neutral. Whole-heartedly they supported the actions of the Stalinist Politbureau against people who they claimed were their co-religionists in the same Church." (L. Blit: *The Eastern Pretender*, p. 168)

The trial of Bishop Kaczmarek, one of some 2,000 priests interned by the secret police purely for exercising their functions as priests, is an example of the way the Pax movement assisted in the persecution of the hierarchy of the Church to which they claimed to belong. Far from protesting at the trial, some members of Pax made public speeches in which they attacked the accused and the hard-pressed Episcopate, who were unable to answer their accusations, which were repeated day after day in the Communist Press and propaganda apparatus. Other, bolder spirits, actually appeared at the trial itself as prosecution witnesses, and condemned the hierarchy in accordance with the line the regime had taken.

Among their other activities, in November 1952 Piasecki and a number of his more prominent followers announced that they had joined the international Communist peace movement, and Pax sent a delegation to North Vietnam to persuade the large Catholic community there to give the Communist rulers of the country their unreserved collaboration.

At the height of the anti-clerical campaign Piasecki published his own *Essential Problems*, the main theme of which was described in the following terms:

"Religion, instead of being the most noble and sublime means for the achievement of salvation, was to become for Piasecki a means of securing for the Church a temporal existence in the revolutionary world. Consequently all Catholics, including bishops and priests, were required to use Catholicism as a source of inspira-

tion for the building of Socialism and to devote most of their time and energy to the realisation of social and economic goals, determined by the atheistic leaders of the state."

(Survey, December 1961, quoted by L. Blit.)

This book was placed on the Vatican Index, and thus is a prohibited book for Catholics throughout the world, and on 8th June, 1955, the Congregation of the Holy Office condemned the propagation of ideas which urged Catholics to help Communism to victory, as voiced especially in Piasecki's weekly *Today and Tomorrow*.

"In its commentary to the decree of the Holy Office the official Vatican daily, the *Osservatore Romano*, explained that Piasecki's theory, developed in his *Essential Problems*, that Communism continues the works of creation and that Communists even while combating religion and the Church are by their work paying homage to God, must be considered blasphemous by any Christian and is certainly in complete contradiction to the basic dogma of the Catholic Church."

(L. Blit: *The Eastern Pretender*, p. 180)

Following this step by the Vatican, the next day the Polish government banned the circulation in Poland of the *Osservatore Romano* and the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. Although Pax adopted an attitude of defiance, Piasecki was forced to give in, and his book was withdrawn and the weekly was stopped suddenly in 1956. However, this did not deter Piasecki from starting a new weekly, *Kierunki* (Directions) in May of the same year, in which he openly demanded recognition from the party for himself and Pax not just as "auxiliaries" but as direct allies of the party who were "entitled to co-govern the country". The Vatican's reply to this move came in the summer of the following year, when the Congregation of the Holy Office forbade members of religious orders and priests to have their books published by Pax or to write in any of Piasecki's periodicals or to assist their distribution among the faithful.

Piasecki's rise to power since the end of the war was little short of meteoric. Successfully riding out every kind of political weather, he consistently defended the role of Soviet Russia as the leader of the Communist world, notwithstanding accusations from the *Osservatore Romano* of accepting funds from Soviet and Polish government sources, and aimed to secure the recognition of the Communist party as their natural ally as the first step towards his ultimate goal of ruling Poland. In this way, within ten years he had become master of a vast economic empire, a unique and perhaps the most astonishing spectacle which has ever been seen behind the Iron Curtain.

On the face of it, this is an impossibility. The existence of a huge

capitalist enterprise within the bosom of the Iron Curtain seems to defy all the most sacred canons of Communist philosophy. What is the explanation of this paradox?

"The decisive reasons for the enormous profits which the Pax enterprises made, and which gave Piasecki an independence which no other organisation outside the Communist party could dream of enjoying, were that the Pax organisation, contrary to all laws in Communist Poland and the publicly expressed intention of its economic leaders, was given privileges which not only no other organisation of a similar character had but which even the enterprises of the Communist state did not enjoy. All state enterprises pay income tax and transfer their profits to the state. Not so the Pax publishing firm."

(L. Blit: *The Eastern Pretender*, p. 155)

Apart from this advantage, Piasecki enjoyed generous supplies of newsprint and machine space, which had been strictly rationed by the party after the war, and had a virtual monopoly in publishing the works of many authors not necessarily sympathetic to the party. This, and the assurance of protection and even material support from the security organs of the Polish and Soviet Russian states, as well as the Soviet secret police, which controlled every tolerated form of Polish public life and political or social activity after the war, enabled Piasecki to turn Pax into the second largest publishing firm in Poland.

Piasecki's alliance with the political police was openly described in a sensational article by Leopold Tyrmand, which was published on 18th November, 1956 by the popular Warsaw weekly, *Swiat* (Issue No. 47—the censor's number is given on page 23 as B-34), whose chief editor, Stefan Arski, was a member of the central party organs.

"It took the Pax people a full year to come out with a statement in which they rejected the accusation. By then the censorship was back to its old form. The opponents of Pax could not pursue the matter publicly any further."

(L. Blit: *The Eastern Pretender*, p. 147)

Nevertheless, some public scrutiny was permitted, for in July 1957 a detailed, well-documented and highly sensational article by Grzegorz Pisarski, a member of the Communist party and a prominent Polish economist, appeared in the Warsaw weekly *Zycie Gospodarcze* (*Economic Life*). Pax was shown to pursue its political and propaganda activities with financial lavishness. They were mostly concerned with Poland, but Pisarski quotes the sum of one hundred and ten thousand roubles allotted for use in Pax's activities in the U.S.A., England, Italy, France and other countries in the West.

All the evidence we have produced above would seem to confirm

that the real reason for the apparent phenomenon of Pax's survival and existence is the explanation given to the author of Piasecki's biography by high officials of the Communist party in Warsaw. They told him:

"Pax is of use to us. It may be of less value in times when we have a moment of real truce with the Church hierarchy. But we are a Marxist state. We are atheists and want the future Polish generations to consider materialism as the only philosophical explanation of the rules governing the Universe and the fate of humanity. Piasecki may be a Catholic, but he is certainly against the Militant Church and against the Polish Episcopate interfering with the activities of the party and state, even in the question of educating the young. We will use him because, willingly or unwillingly, he makes our task easier."

(L. Blit: *The Eastern Pretender*, p. 208)

It is against this background of events that the Secretariat of the French Episcopate received a letter on 6th June, 1963 from His Grace the Apostolic Nuncio in which he stated that the Cardinal Secretary of State at the Vatican had asked him to draw the attention of the Episcopate and the Major Religious Superiors in France to the enclosed report on the activities of Pax, drawn up by Cardinal Wyszyński, who had summed it up in the following words:

"Firstly, Pax is not an organisation with a cultural objective. It is purely a medium for the dissemination of propaganda in disguise in order to denigrate the work of the Church in Poland by spreading false information.

"Secondly, this movement receives its orders and directives from the Communist party, the secret police, and the office for religious affairs.

"Thirdly, in return for its submission, Pax enjoys certain facilities and support, as for example, in its publications and commercial undertakings."

There now follows below the complete text of the report prepared by Cardinal Wyszyński, as forwarded to the Bishops and Major Religious Superiors in France:

For some time, but especially since the beginning of the Council, the Pax group, which claims to be the "movement of progressive Catholics in Poland", has been intensifying its propaganda activities in the West, and particularly in France, disseminating false or ambiguous reports which are damaging to the Church. Pax exploits the ignorance of certain Catholic circles in the West in respect of what has come to be called "the Polish experiment in co-existence" as well as the enforced silence of Polish bishops,

priests and laymen who refuse to give any information concerning "the realities of the Polish situation", knowing full well that on their return every word they said would be subject to the scrutiny of the police and that the least indiscretion on their part could lead to severe reprisals.

Under these conditions, which favour the proliferation of erroneous opinions to the great detriment of the Church in Poland, a word of warning is timely.

1. Outside Poland Pax represents itself as a "movement" of progressive Polish Catholics. As a result it tends to be compared to Western progressive movements, which, living under democratic forms of government, are completely free to proclaim their opinions and sympathies for the programmes and leanings of the political Left of their respective countries.

In reality, Pax is not a "movement" but a closely-connected organ of the police machine, directly responsible to the Minister of the Interior, and blindly obedient to the directives of the secret police, the U.B.

This fact is well known in Poland, but people realise that it is dangerous to talk about it. Once only, under cover of the "thaw" in October 1956, Communists and Catholics joined in denouncing and stigmatising publicly the character and activities of this secret, Stalinist agency of the U.B. It was an outburst of long pent-up resentment against notorious and feared double agents whose activities sickened not only Catholics but also honest Communists. Let us emphasise that at this time the Communist Press was particularly savage in its attacks on Pax. It even went so far as to publish its balance sheets in an economic review in order to show the very special favours it enjoyed from the government, including, among others, exemption from all income tax, lucrative concessions and a monopoly in certain reserved fields of production (religious publications and sacred art), which had turned Pax into a veritable capitalist trust under a Communist regime.

The freedom of expression due to the "thaw" of 1956 was quickly throttled, but the Polish people had made full use of the interval to find out truths which had been so long withheld from them, and never, since then, has Pax been able to exercise the slightest effective influence over the masses, the labourers and peasants, from whom it has become completely cut off.

The justification of its existence on the political chess-board of the Communist party is thus reduced to its efficacy abroad where its collaboration is proving to be most valuable. France, notably, was confided in a quite exceptional manner to the services of Pax, discreetly supported by Polish diplomatic circles.

2. In order to understand fully the activities of Pax, it is as well to go back to its beginnings. Its founder, Piasecki, condemned to death by the Soviet authorities for resistance activities, saved his life at the price of an explicit undertaking to penetrate and enslave the Church for the benefit of the Communist revolution.

From the beginning, therefore, Pax has borne the character of a strictly controlled secret agency. All its members are salaried officials (the forms of payment vary) appointed to carry out and report on definite projects.

Their orders emanate from the central office of the Communist party. Mr. Piasecki is directly subject to the "Security Office" (U.B.), and to the Office for Religious Affairs, which has absolute, and in fact total power over everything concerning the Catholic Church in Poland.¹

Piasecki's role has not always been easy. He has had to steer between the reefs of the "Party" and the "Anti-Party". Disgraced after the thaw of 1956, he has been able to re-establish his position bit by bit, owing to the valuable services he is rendering abroad, particularly in France.

In Poland, Pax is completely cut off from the masses of peasants and labourers, who are more independent and have greater freedom to demonstrate their distrust. The intellectuals, especially the writers, are clearly more vulnerable due to the fact that Pax owns a prosperous publishing business, which pays well. In a country in which even the government admits that salaries seldom reach the minimum subsistence level, the temptation to collaborate with Pax is obviously great and a refusal to collaborate in any way presupposes an unusual strength of character. Some recognised writers have allowed themselves to be enlisted for the material advantages offered. No one is unaware of the influence Pax has over certain intellectuals due to these material advantages, nor that, stripped of its funds, it would lose overnight the only power of attraction it possesses in Poland.

Above this starveling mob of unwilling profiteers and traffickers

¹ When required to deal with questions which concern the Church, even if only indirectly, the Polish Ministries immediately declare that they are "incompetent" (as the Ministry of Defence did, for example, when seminarists were called up for military service as a reprisal for the "over-stubborn" attitude of the Bishops) and refer them automatically to the Office for Religious Affairs, the head of which, Mr. Zabinski, a former Stalinist sent into retirement in 1956 and since rehabilitated, disposes of practically unlimited powers for dealing with all matters concerning the Church. This Office and its director are commonly called "the Tribunal of the Communist Inquisition" and its Grand Inquisitor.

in progressivism, there is a limited circle of "initiates", who form a closed, and impermeable caste bound by pledges, and even by precise and binding oaths. Piasecki is the undisputed head of Pax at all levels.

In 1955 Piasecki revealed his capacities with the publication (at the height of the Stalinist terror and during the imprisonment of Cardinal Wyszynski and other Polish bishops) of his book, *Essential Problems*, which has since been condemned by the Holy Office. This condemnation obliged Piasecki to revise his position. Western Catholics loudly publicised his submission without suspecting that it was only as one who had "submitted", and who thus was not outside but inside the Church, that he was of the slightest value to the Communist party. Leaving aside therefore, the possible merits of the withdrawal of his book and the new orientation of his review, let us not forget that once exposed, Pax had no alternative but to submit. It is significant that since then, and until very recently, Pax has shown a great concern for orthodoxy in its publications.

4. In fact only the tactics have changed. The strategic plan has not been altered in any way. For some months, Pax has been busy reviving and disseminating the far-fetched ideas of *Essential Problems*.

It is noteworthy that the years of Cardinal Wyszynski's imprisonment mark the apogee of Piasecki's power. It was at this time that, on the orders of its mighty masters, Pax took over all the Catholic publications that had up to then been independent. Under de-Stalinisation it suffered an eclipse and for a time barely ticked over. It is only quite recently that Piasecki's star has begun to shine once more, thanks to the task entrusted to him in connection with the Ecumenical Council.

5. Before considering in detail the character of his mission to the Council, let us recall briefly the principles which have never ceased to guide Piasecki's activities, and which, moreover, have always dovetailed faultlessly into the Communist party plan.¹

"To put an end to religion", said Lenin, "it is much more important to introduce class war into the bosom of the Church than to attack religion directly."

¹ This identity of outlook and even of expression strikes every reader of the Polish Press. The Pax publications are a servile reproduction, even down to their very use of expressions, of the official Press. There seems to be an invisible conductor whose task it is to score in the minutest details. Thus quite recently the servile conformity in the opinions of the entire Polish Press on the Council leapt to the eye. We do not know of one single instance in which Pax has given proof of independence by siding with the Church and against its paymasters.

The technique is to act as a solvent and form cells of disunity among the faithful, but especially in the ranks of the priests and religious; split the bishops into two blocs, the "integralists" and the "progressives"; use a thousand pretexts to align the priests against their bishops; drive a subtle wedge into the masses by cleverly contrived distinctions between "reactionaries" and "progressives"; never attack the Church directly, but, "only for her own good" attack "her antiquated structure" and "the abuses which disfigure her." If necessary appear to be more Catholic than the Pope; skilfully undermine the Church by attracting into ecclesiastical circles groups of "discontented" Catholics, so as to lure the former bit by bit "into the fertile climate of class struggle"; slowly and patiently work for this "adaptation" by introducing new forms into traditional ideas. The ambiguity of certain terms, such as "progressivism" and "integralism", "open" and "closed" attitudes, democracy and socialism, and so on, which have entirely different meanings in France and in Poland, help to create misunderstanding.

In short, it is not a question of "liquidating" the Church, but of putting the Church in step by enlisting her in the service of the Communist revolution.

"We are working to facilitate an inevitable historical process which will compel the Church to reconsider her position", wrote Piasecki in an editorial on nth November, 1955.

At the same time, Piasecki strives to exploit the messianic ideas which flatter national amour propre: might not Poland be called by Providence to serve as the model for co-existence between the Catholic Church and the Communist state?

"Obviously", he writes, "in order that Poland may serve as a model, it is essential that Polish Catholicism becomes progressive as quickly as possible and collaborates increasingly actively in the construction of a socialist economy. That is the daily task of our progressive movement." (Whitsun, 1956)

6. In order to achieve these objectives, it was absolutely necessary for "intelligent Catholics, both priests and laymen, to pluck up the requisite courage and valid arguments in order to make the bishops hear reason and win them over to a true appreciation of temporal politico-social reality."

When these attempts by Pax failed, "in the autumn of 1953 a fresh, very determined effort had to be made in order to assure a normal development in the relations between the Church and state ... by the decision of the government forbidding Cardinal Wyszynski all activities."

(Piasecki: *Essential Problems*, pp. 184-185)

This "decision" seemed to open before Piasecki an unlimited

field of action. Drunk with success, he then openly took the part of the government against the prisoner bishops.

The brutal frankness of his announcements revealed his true character to the people. During the years of Cardinal Wyszyński's imprisonment, Piasecki, sure of himself and of his masters, no longer hid his hand. Cynically, he only assigned a "functional role" to the Church in the socialist camp, that of a "productive function verifiable throughout history."

(Piasecki: Essential Problems, *ibid.*)

The release of Cardinal Wyszyński in the autumn of 1956 was a grave personal set-back to Piasecki, and the resentment born of it explains the rancour which he pours into his campaigns of denigration, insinuation, nay calumny of which Cardinal Wyszyński more than any other Polish bishop bears the brunt. Though ineffective in Poland, this campaign is not without influence on foreigners who do not know the facts of the situation.

Here, by way of example, are some of the main charges insidiously put about through Piasecki's agencies:

The Polish bishops are said to be "Great Lords" in the feudal manner, well-furnished with the goods of this world, and keeping the priests and faithful at their distance.

The laity are supposedly "kept down" by bishops who deny them all initiative under an out-of-date form of clericalism.

The truth is that in Poland today, no bishop has a bank account, for the simple reason that it would be immediately confiscated by the Treasury. The facade of "Great Lords", therefore, conceals a genuine poverty, which no one in Poland likes advertising (especially before foreigners), and which entails living from day to day on such means as Providence may provide. But there is something more. The Polish bishops guard their poverty jealously because through it they are brought into close contact with the masses. When, during the "thaw" in 1956, Gomułka's government offered to restore confiscated Church property to the Episcopate, the bishops, meeting in plenary session on 14th December, 1956, unanimously declined the offer "in order to remain close to the heart of the masses". A Polish bishop spends his life in pastoral visitations and feels perfectly at ease and "at home" among the peasants or labourers. This is a social phenomenon which is unknown in those countries where the masses have become dechristianised.

As for the laity, every bishop and every parish priest has his diocesan or parish "council", which renders invaluable service and forms a veritable bastion against repressive measures by the Office for Religious Affairs. When such measures are implemented despite

their opposition, the laity protest silently by attending church in their thousands. What bishop, having received some cruel blow the night before, has not seen the crowds of silent men gather at his Mass, old and young, their bearing grave and resolute? These laymen, denied the means for apostolate accorded in Western countries, by their character and numbers represent a force which the government fears, and which explains, at least in part, the exceptional position of the Church in Poland under a Communist government. Let us stress that no member of Pax is nor could become a member of the diocesan or parish councils.

Foreign visitors sponsored by Pax and shown only what their Pax guides want them to see, obviously know nothing of the true relationship between the laity and their pastor.

7. With the calling of the Ecumenical Council, Piasecki was entrusted with a mission which has restored weight to both his political prestige and his finances.

One hundred million zlotys as an annual grant (instead of fifty million), one hundred regions as his sphere of operations, instead of thirty: such is the price, paid in advance, for securing Piasecki's active participation in the exploitation of the Council for the benefit of the "socialist camp".

It is a significant fact that it is Polish Communists who are disgusted by Piasecki's activities and who regard him as a "notorious double agent", who keep the bishops informed and on their guard. "We want a straightforward ideological struggle", they say, "not a system of oppression which uses the police machinery and administrative measures to achieve its ends".

It is interesting to note that some Polish atheist bodies occasionally invite the bishops to secret discussions on questions in which they are deeply interested, whereas they refuse to debate with Pax, which they distrust.

8. It is abroad, therefore, that the only available field of action remains open to Pax. Having failed to disrupt the unity of the Polish Episcopate, Pax is now endeavouring to represent it as being in opposition both to John XXIII, who is acclaimed as "the Pope of co-existence", and to the "open" and "progressive" French Episcopate.

Since the beginning of 1963 this thesis, which had been ceaselessly hammered out for some time, suddenly acquired a new depth and particular over-tones. The style of the Pax press becomes increasingly virulent and aggressive.

The Encyclical *Pacem in Terris* was hailed noisily and "with deep satisfaction" as the "official consecration" and "coronation of the efforts" which Piasecki and his group had made for so long.

"The head of the Church has agreed with those who have pledged themselves to an ideology of co-existence and co-operation with those professing different ideologies, and that is precisely the essence of the programme of our political Left."

(*Slowo Powszechne*, 2nd May, 1963)

According to Pax, thanks to Pope John XXIII, the "tridentine era" in the history of the Church seems definitely over and a new epoch is beginning, "more open and more tolerant, ready for compromises".

Of course, "John XXIII's line . . . calls on the Polish Episcopate to reconsider its out-of-date position and its attachment to the integralism of Pope Pius XII". The Pax press insinuates that Cardinal Wyszyński and the Polish bishops are very disturbed by this "revolutionary" change of position by John XXIII and that with the help of "conservative elements" in the Vatican they are doing everything within their power to minimize the scope of this "historic" encyclical.

9. It goes without saying that Pax refuses to see in *Pacem in Terris* anything which is contrary to its ideological professions, and the censor's refusal for the publication of the Polish translation of *Mater et Magistra* is passed over in silence.

On the other hand the duties of the Polish bishops which apparently derive from this great charter for co-existence, as Pax calls *Pacem in Terris*, are minutely described:

"The ground-work for the normalisation of relations between the Church and State, which is so keenly awaited, involves the formal recognition by the Polish Episcopate of the permanency of the socialist order with all that this implies".

(*Slowo Powszechne*, 25th April, 1963)

This statement of Jankowski's, editor of *Slowo Powszechne*, the Pax daily paper, leaves no doubt as to the conditions required by the Warsaw government for the "so keenly awaited" normalisation of relations between the Church and State. It is a question, in short, of the acceptance in full of the notorious principle "Politics First", by the total subordination of the Church to the advancement of the Communist revolution.

In order that there may be no doubt on this point, Jankowski insists:

"The chief lesson to be drawn from the dialogue between the Catholic Left and the socialist world is above all the acknowledgement of the inescapable need to enrich the content of Socialism through Christians allying themselves to the party of the working class."

(*Slowo Powszechne*, *ibid.*)

Jankowski instructs the bishops in this vein: the Pope "having

formally recognised the primacy of the principle of peaceful coexistence", the Polish Episcopate should draw from it the consequences "consistent with the needs of Poland by publishing a special declaration which would be the starting point for the normalisation of relations between the Church and State."

(*Slowo Powszechnie*, *ibid.*)

In other words, this "normalisation" can only take place at the price of a formal committal of the Church in Poland to the service of a particular party.

Now the representatives of Pax "feel that Pope John has given them a mandate for action".

Consequently, the Pax press lavishes advice and even thinly veiled threats on the Polish bishops, which recall in a striking manner the psychological campaigns of the Stalin era.

Thus the protests by Cardinal Wyszynski and the Polish Episcopate against the intrusion of the State into religious education, which may only be carried out within a Church, has met with the official displeasure of Pax.

In an editorial in *Slowo Powszechnie* on 11th April, 1963 headed "Responsibility for a long term view" we read the following:

"Peaceful co-existence is not helped by carrying over into the realm of politics obvious philosophical contradictions. It is necessary to state with profound disquiet that, unhappily, some sermons of the Primate of Poland are not free from this tendency. Thus the Cardinal judged it opportune, in a sermon to the Religious Orders, to return to the question, which has already been settled and is in full operation, of religious teaching outside the schools, and this in a way which, unfortunately, does not help towards the solution of the difficult and complicated problems besetting the relations between the Church and State".

However, three weeks before this article appeared, a pastoral letter dated 21st March, 1963 had been circulated by the Polish Episcopate, giving the faithful a short review of the question which was supposedly "settled and in full operation".

(a). Since the beginning of 1963 there has been a constant increase in the number of enactments aimed at religious teaching.

(b). The Office for Religious Affairs forbade priests belonging to religious orders, even if they were parish priests or curates, and nuns and even many lay catechists to teach catechism.

(c). Religious instruction is forbidden in private houses, parish halls, chapels and even in certain churches.

(d). Some Inspectors of Public Education demand from parish priests detailed reports on the religious instruction given in their churches, and they are increasing the number of their inspections.

(e). The parish priests who refuse to draw up these reports are punished with crippling fines of up to ten thousand zlotys or more. Those who are unable to pay these exorbitant sums are threatened with, and often suffer, imprisonment or distraints.

(f). All manner of intimidation and even threats are used to hinder children attending catechism. Parents who refuse to submit are heavily punished. Certain social groups (civil servants, agents of the U.B., etc.), are officially forbidden to send their children to catechism under pain of dismissal.

(g). Every year thousands of children gather at the holiday centres, and a thousand and one pretexts are advanced to prevent them attending Mass on Sundays. In some cases they are kept behind barbed-wire enclosures for the duration of the parish Masses.

(h). No priest has any right whatever to enter the boundaries of these holiday centres or camps.

(i). The children who do succeed in escaping to Mass on Sundays are punished.

(j). Young people who go out on excursions with a priest are followed by the police, often in helicopters, in order to check whether they are attending Mass in the shelter of the forest or the mountains. Caught in the act, students are often refused the right to continue their studies.

All this pettifogging vexation is in direct contradiction not only to the Constitution of the People's Republic of Poland and the agreement of 1950, but also to the international laws and charters, guaranteeing liberty of conscience and freedom of religious instruction, which are officially recognised by the Polish government.

Alerted by the Office for Religious Affairs, agents of the secret police visited every parish priest in Poland and forbade them to read this pastoral letter from their pulpits, since it would jeopardize the regime. Faced with their resistance, they resorted to threats and told the priests to expect serious consequences.

"Nothing could be worse than it is!", replied Mgr. Choroman-ski, the secretary of the Polish Episcopate.

10. The attitude of Pax, in the light of the pastoral letter of the Polish Episcopate, is most instructive. Far from associating itself with the protest of the bishops, who were faced with an agonising situation, which arouses furious indignation in every honest man, even among unbelievers, Pax claimed that the question of religious instruction in Poland, which was more open to discussion than ever, "had been settled and was in full operation". In so doing, it obeyed the Party to the detriment of the Church.

No one is deceived by these tactics in Poland. It is well known in advance that every Communist slogan published in the official

press is taken up and minted anew by Pax. But it is not the same abroad, especially in France, where Pax's propaganda continues to grow in intensity, skilfully exploiting the sympathies and leanings of the French progressives and profiting from their support. The greatest secrecy is maintained about everything concerning Pax's direct subordination to the secret police in Poland.

On the other hand, the agents of Pax entrusted with assignments in France loudly proclaim the "persecutions" they allege they have suffered at the hands of the "retrograde" and "integra-list" Polish Episcopate. This campaign of denigration is particularly aimed at Cardinal Wyszyński.

11. Having at its disposal considerable funds, Pax has been busy for some time building up its contacts and propaganda through the distribution, in French, of a Review of the Catholic Press in Poland, which serves its ends.

Pax also helps to arrange tours in Poland for Catholic priests and laymen, whom it sponsors, and who return to France with a very partial, one-sided, and indeed erroneous view of the real situation in Poland. The French priests shown round by Pax only meet "patriotic priests" in Poland. The Polish bishops decline to meet them, fearing indiscretions. They return to France to spread reports about Poland, often over the wireless, as in the case of Father Molin, which, although perhaps they are made in all good faith, bear little relation to the truth.

In France the agents of Pax are in permanent contact with certain groups of Catholic progressives who rally to their defence whenever they believe them threatened. Pax has managed, in the main, to implant in certain French Catholic circles the belief that it is persecuted by Cardinal Wyszyński and the Polish Episcopate on account of its progressive tendencies.

This attitude was most distinctly revealed when a series of articles on the position of the Church in Poland appeared in *La Croix* in February 1962. The Reverend Father Wenger, editor of the paper, was immediately taken to task by priests and laymen who vehemently denied the contents of these articles taking advantage of the fact that they had travelled and toured in Poland.

For the most part they were friends of Pax and belonged to the Informations Catholiques Internationales.

When he was told that Cardinal Wyszyński had confirmed the accuracy of the facts reported in *La Croix* articles, not daring to attack him openly, de Broucker, editor of Informations Catholiques Internationales, revealed his thoughts in one of his "Letters to the friends of I.C.I.", distributed only to the inner circle of his followers, in which he gave it to be understood that at the Council

Cardinal Wyszyński ought to render an account of himself to the Cardinals of the Roman Church, "his judges and his peers".

When the La Croix articles were about to appear as a book, the Ecclesiastical Censor for Paris informed the author that "not having found any doctrinal errors in the text, he was unable to refuse the imprimatur, but that he hoped that the author would have the courage (to use his very own words) to suppress the chapter dealing with Pax".

Once published, Pierre Lenert's book, *The Catholic Church in Poland*, became the object of a fierce campaign on the part of Pax and its French friends. Curiously, in its bulletin Pax expressed its surprise that the imprimatur could have been granted to this work.

Not one single fact in the book is denied. Pax admits that Lenert's book had been "circulated" during the first session of the Council, but omits to say that when the Polish bishops were consulted about it, they unanimously acknowledged the accuracy of the facts it contains. It is obvious that Pax is afraid of being exposed in France.

For its very existence is at stake. If it were recognised by Western Catholics that it is simply the agency of a police network entrusted with the penetration and subjection of the Church, it would lose its following in their ranks, and in so doing, it would lose its justification in the eyes of its paymasters.

"It is not the Communists whom we fear", said a Polish bishop. "What fills us with anguish is the spectacle of false brethren."

(Cardinal Wyszyński's Report on Pax, sent to the French Episcopate by the Cardinal Secretary of State at the Vatican in June 1963)

After the manner of Communism, Freemasonry no longer sets itself up as the declared adversary of the Church. Instead of openly attacking her, it is seeking to infiltrate and penetrate her in order to impose its own humanitarian, naturalistic and anti-traditional conceptions.

The success of the general penetration of the forces of subversion was made possible by the support, which at times attained a fanatical pitch, of progressive elements in the Church, and the last Council revealed to the whole world the strength and extent of their ascendancy. We are confronted here with a new and absolutely unprecedented situation in the history of Christianity, which would now appear to be in a state of permanent civil war. Subversion has entered the very heart of the Church, and all her traditional doctrines are being questioned. This is a state of affairs the gravity of which cannot be concealed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

of principal works quoted * denotes foreign works available in the British Museum

- BATAULT, G. *Le Probleme Juif*, 1921.
- BENAMOZEGH, E. *Israel et l'Humanite*, 1961*.
- BUT, L. *The Eastern Pretender*, 1965.
- BORD, G. *La Franc-Maconnerie en France des origines a 1815*, 1908*.
- CLEMENT XII. In *Eminentia*, 1738*.
- CORBIN, R. *Symboles Initiatiques et Mysteres Chretiens*, 1929.
- CORNELOUP, C. *Universalisme et Franc-Maconnerie*, 1963.
- DESCHAMPS, N., S.J. *Les Societes secretes et la Societe*, 2nd edition, 1880*.
- DOUSSINAGUE, Sr. *Espana Tenia Razon*, 1949 (Calpe, Madrid).
- FEJTO, F. *Dieu et son Juif*, 1960*.
- HANNAH, W. *Darkness Visible*, 1966.
- HUNT, P. *The Menace of Freemasonry to the Christian Faith*, 1929.
- HUTIN, S. *Les Gnostiques*, 1906.
- LANE, A. BLISS. *I saw Poland Betrayed*, 1948.
- LEBEY, A. *Dans l'Atelier Maconnique*.
- LEO XIII. *Humanum Genus*, Encyclical Letter on Freemasonry, 1884, tr. by Rev. D. Fahey, 1953.
- MARTIN, G. *La Franc-Maconnerie Francaise et la Revolution*, 1926*.
- Manuel d'Histoire de la Franc-Maconnerie en France*, 1932*.
- MELLOR, A. *La Franc-Maconnerie a l'Heure du Choix*, 1963. *Our Separated Brethren*, 1964.
- MICHEL, A. G. *La Dictature de la Franc-Maconnerie sur la France*, 1924*.
- PIKE, A. *Morals and Dogma*, 1927 (original edition 1832).
- RIVIERE, J. MARQUES. *La Trahison Spirituelle de la Franc-Maconnerie*, 1931.
- SPIRE, A. *Quelques Juifs*, 1928*.
- STEWART, T. M. *Symbolic Teachings—or Masonry and its Message*, 1917.
- TEDER, L. *Irregularite du Grand Orient de France*, 1909.
- VINATREL, G. *Communisme et Franc-Maconnerie*, 1961.
- WEBSTER, N. H. *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, 1964.
- WIRTH, O. *Le Livre du Compagnon; Le Livre de l'Apprenti* (both of which were published in separate parts in *La Franc-Maconnerie rendue intelligible a ses adeptes*, 1927), *L'Ideal Initiatique*, 1927.
- WYSZYNSKI, CARDINAL. *Report on Pax*.



STATE

SECRETS

COUNT LEON de PONCINS

STATE SECRETS

A DOCUMENTATION OF THE SECRET
REVOLUTIONARY MAINSPRING GOVERNING
ANGLO-AMERICAN POLITICS

*Translated from the
French edition of
COMTE LÉON DE PONCINS'*

Top Secret
by
Timothy Tindal-Robertson



DEVON
BRITONS PUBLISHING COMPANY
MCMLXXV

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>page</i>
Introduction	7
1 The Landman Document	9
2 Versailles to World War II	18
3 Terror Bombing and the Destruction of Dresden	35
4 The Nuremberg Trial	50
5 The Mysterious Teheran and Yalta Agreements and the Secret Zabrowsky Document	75
6 The Morgenthau, Kaufman and Bar-Zohar Documents	95
7 The Korean War, the Sorge Spy Ring and the MacArthur-Willoughby Report	150
8 The Brownell-Truman Controversy	170
9 America and Israel	183
Bibliography	188
Index	189

INTRODUCTION

When one considers the gigantic economic power and the crushing industrial superiority of the United States in the modern world, and the decadence and partial ruin of the old European states, ravaged and bled white by a series of wars and revolutions, it becomes apparent that the western world has virtually succumbed to a state of vassalage under America, and accordingly has to endure the latter's political repercussions.

Whether we like it or not, the decisions of the American Government are of absolutely vital interest to our countries, and accordingly we have every reason to study with care the turn of events in influential circles in the USA.

Now it is an established fact that some of the dramatic events in the Second World War brought to light with brutal clarity the preponderant influence which was exerted by anonymous, irresponsible and elusive occult forces on the vital decisions taken by some of the American leaders—decisions which have and will determine the future of the world—and which became particularly evident in the course of F. D. Roosevelt's virtual dictatorship.

As we have said, this conclusion is an established fact, and we will shortly produce the evidence to prove it, but meanwhile we must point out that we are not attempting to write a complete history of the inside story of American politics. This would be impossible, for it is not easy to unveil the secrecy with which the occult forces cover their actions. Our aim is much more modest. We intend to bring to light part of the evidence, in the same way that the beam of a torch abruptly pierces the darkness of night and reveals people and things which had been hidden until then. It is absolutely essential for the forces of the occult to act under cover of mist and darkness if their work is to succeed.

However, by means of irrefutable facts and documents we are in a position to prove every statement we advance, and in this manner we propose to demonstrate the action of these occult forces in the course of certain crucial periods of American and Western political history, namely:

1. The entry of the United States into the First World War (the Landman document), followed by the Treaty of Versailles.
2. The preparation of the Second World War (the Montigny-Ludwig documents).
3. The mysterious Yalta agreements (the Zabrowsky document).
4. American war policy (the Morgenthau documents); the aerial war in Europe (the Lindemann document); the Nuremberg trial.
5. The Korean war; the Sorge spy ring (the MacArthur and Willoughby documents).
6. The Brownell-Truman controversy.
7. The political advisers of the White House under President Nixon.

By means of patient research I have assembled in this book a collection of documents which are not actually secret in themselves, but which have been published in different countries in varying circumstances, in partial, fragmentary, or diluted forms, so that they have remained virtually unknown to the public at large.

The Zabrowsky document is unknown outside Spain; the Morgenthau documents, which have recently been published in the USA, are unknown in France; and the Willoughby, MacArthur and Flynn documents have only reached a limited public of specialists even in America.

Collected together in this study for the first time, they create a coherent impact which they do not possess individually. Nevertheless, in the course of this work I have never advanced a conclusion which does not rest upon documents of absolutely unimpeachable authority.

Thus my endeavour is to make available to my readers the awareness of the existence of certain subterranean forces which threaten to undermine the future of our ancient western civilization.

I

THE LANDMAN DOCUMENT

Is it possible, is it even conceivable that the Jews, by sheer weight of their influence alone, could unleash a world war? It is probably unbelievable, and yet this is exactly what has happened three times in the course of the last half century, in 1900, with the Transvaal war, in 1917, with the entrance of the Americans into the war on the side of the Allies, and in 1939, with the commencement of the Second World War.

In this chapter I am simply going to deal with the case of the entry of the United States into the First World War in 1917 on the side of the Allies, and I will show that this contention rests on solid proof.

Let us briefly recall the facts. By 1917 the English-French alliance was in a difficult position and in danger of losing the war against Imperial Germany. The latter, whose hands had been freed from the Russian front by the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, was about to hurl all its strength against the western front, which was in danger of being swept away by the violence of their attack. The Allies urgently needed American aid.

The United States did not hesitate to enter the war on the Allies' side. The official pretext invoked in favour of this move was the sinking of the English liner, *Lusitania*, by a German submarine, which resulted in the deaths of a certain number of American passengers.

But the negotiations and pressures which brought about this situation are the subject of this chapter, for the facts which we are about to relate are virtually unknown to the public.

In 1929 a Polish writer, E. Malynski, published a book revealing the unknown facts behind these historic events entitled *La Démocratie victorieuse*, a work which was subsequently shown to be quite prophetic.

Basing his argument on a profound knowledge of international politics and upon a logical deduction of the facts, Malynski concluded that America's entrance into the war on the side of the Allies was due to Jewish influence.

"If there had not been the *Lusitania* affair, the asphyxiating gases, or the intrigues of German and Austrian ambassadors on American territory, in which they were surely not unique, other ways would have been found to achieve the same results. No provocation would have been too severe to obtain them, since democracy was in danger and it urgently needed American intervention to come to its aid.

"Democracy was in danger, and that is the most important point and indeed the pivot of all contemporary history. The rest is just empty meaningless phrases, fodder which is thrown to beasts who are being led to the slaughter-house.

"The apparent spontaneity of their enthusiasm for war, which shook the American people, should not astonish those who know America, or who lived there for some years before 1914. For at that time thousands and thousands of non-Jewish people, who had nevertheless been intoxicated by a costly and clever publicity campaign, demanded at the tops of their voices that diplomatic and commercial relations should be broken off with the Tsar's government—a measure which would gravely prejudice the American portfolio—for the sole reason that a mean and obscure little Jew, who was completely unknown in his own town, but whose international ubiquity had organized his defence, had been brought before a court of assize and the regular jury of a provincial city in the Russian empire on a charge, whether justly or unjustly, of committing a ritual murder.

"On both occasions, the result was exactly the same: the nation which above all others claims to be free and in sovereign command of its own destiny was brainwashed to the hilt.

"In 1914 any American would have laughed to scorn the idea that in three years time he would be struggling and suffering in France for the sake of affairs which had no connection with those of his own country.

"And yet, when 1917 came, the same man enlisted enthusiastically. Every soldier whom we happened to interview and questioned as to his personal motives for fighting, invariably replied: 'we are fighting for democracy'. They were one step ahead of their fellow soldiers from other nations, who went for their own country's sake.

"It is only when we realize that France was invaded by hundreds of thousands of inhabitants from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Florida, Illinois, Wyoming, California, Louisiana, and subsequently from Ontario, Manitoba, Rhodesia and New South Wales, whose only possible motive was to hasten the triumph of democracy, that

we begin to understand something of the power of Israel. The power to stir up a whole nation of solid, egoistical and utilitarian individuals, and to persuade them that their greatest privilege is to set out and get themselves killed at the uttermost ends of the earth, with no hope of gain for themselves or their children and almost without their understanding against or for whom they are fighting, or why, is a simply incredible phenomenon which makes one afraid when one comes to think about it."

(E. Malynski: *La Démocratie victorieuse*)

I remember very well showing this book to the director of a big London daily paper, and asking him his opinion of it. He said that British opinion would never accept it, and he did not conceal from me the fact that he thought the author was suffering from a form of mania.

However, in March 1936, a Zionist Jew named Samuel Landman published a work called *Great Britain, The Jews and Palestine* under the auspices of the Zionist Association, which deals with Zionism and the entry of the United States into the war. As the preface of the book clearly states, the author is a very well-known English Zionist. He was the honorary secretary of the Zionist Council of the United Kingdom in 1912, editor of *The Zionist* from 1913-1914, and author of various Zionist publications which came out during the war. From 1917-1922 he was the solicitor and secretary of the Zionist organization, and later became its legal adviser. As a Jewish document, therefore, it may be considered to carry official weight.

Landman's work contains a staggering confirmation of Malynski's thesis. Needless to say, he does not reveal everything, but what he does state reveals a number of stupefying horizons, for he proves in detail that it is the Jews, set in motion, as they themselves admit, by their own exclusively Jewish interests and possessions, who launched America into the world war. The passage which follows is taken without abridgement from the opening pages of Landman's *Great Britain, The Jews and Palestine*:

"As the Balfour Declaration originated in the War Office, was consummated in the Foreign Office and is being implemented in the Colonial Office, and as some of those responsible for it have passed away or have retired since its migrations from Department to Department, there is necessarily some confusion or misunderstanding as to its *raison d'être* and importance to the parties primarily concerned. It would, therefore, seem opportune to recapitulate briefly the circumstances, the inner history and incidents that eventually led to the British Mandate for Palestine.

"Those who assisted at the birth of the Balfour Declaration were few in number. This makes it important to bring into proper relief the services of one who, owing above all to his modesty, has hitherto remained in the background. His services however should take their proper place in the front rank alongside of those Englishmen of vision whose services are more widely known, including the late Sir Mark Sykes, the Rt. Hon. W. Ormsby Gore, the Rt. Hon. Sir Ronald Graham, General Sir George Macdonagh and Mr. G. H. Fitzmaurice.

"In the early years of the War great efforts were made by the Zionist Leaders, Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow, chiefly through the late Mr. C. P. Scott of the *Manchester Guardian*, and Sir Herbert Samuel, to induce the Cabinet to espouse the cause of Zionism.

"These efforts were, however, without avail. In fact, Sir Herbert Samuel has publicly stated that he had no share in the initiation of the negotiations which led to the Balfour Declaration. (*England and Palestine*, a lecture delivered by Sir Herbert Samuel and published by the Jewish Historical Society, February 1936.) The actual initiator was Mr. James A. Malcolm and the following is a brief account of the circumstances in which the negotiations took place.

"During the critical days of 1916 and of the impending defection of Russia, Jewry, as a whole, was against the Czarist regime and had hopes that Germany, if victorious, would in certain circumstances give them Palestine. Several attempts to bring America into the War on the side of the Allies by influencing influential Jewish opinion were made and had failed. Mr. James A. Malcolm, who was already aware of German pre-war efforts to secure a foothold in Palestine through the Zionist Jews and of the abortive Anglo-French démarches at Washington and New York; and knew that Mr. Woodrow Wilson, for good and sufficient reasons, always attached the greatest possible importance to the advice of a very prominent Zionist (Mr. Justice Brandeis, of the US Supreme Court); and was in close touch with Mr. Greenberg, Editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* (London); and knew that several important Zionist Jewish leaders had already gravitated to London from the Continent on the *qui vive* awaiting events; and appreciated and realized the depth and strength of Jewish national aspirations; spontaneously took the initiative, to convince first of all Sir Mark Sykes, Under-Secretary to the War Cabinet, and afterwards M. Georges Picot, of the French Embassy in London, and M. Goût of the Quai d'Orsay (Eastern Section), that the best

and perhaps the only way (which proved so to be) to induce the American President to come into the War was to secure the co-operation of Zionist Jews by promising them Palestine, and thus enlist and mobilize the hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces of Zionist Jews in America and elsewhere in favour of the Allies on a *quid pro quo* contract basis. Thus, as will be seen, the Zionists, having carried out their part, and greatly helped to bring America in, the Balfour Declaration of 1917 was but the public confirmation of the necessarily secret 'gentleman's' agreement of 1916 made with the previous knowledge, acquiescence and/or approval of the Arabs and of the British, American, French and other Allied Governments, and not merely a voluntary altruistic and romantic gesture on the part of Great Britain as certain people either through pardonable ignorance assume or unpardonable illwill would represent or misrepresent.

"Sir Mark Sykes was Under-Secretary to the War Cabinet specially concerned with Near Eastern affairs, and, although at the time scarcely acquainted with the Zionist movement, and unaware of the existence of its leaders, he had the flair to respond to the arguments advanced by Mr. Malcolm as to the strength and importance of this movement in Jewry, in spite of the fact that many wealthy and prominent international or semi-assimilated Jews in Europe and America were openly or tacitly opposed to it (Zionist movement) or timidly indifferent. MM. Picot and Goult were likewise receptive.

"An interesting account of the negotiations carried on in London and Paris, and subsequent developments, has already appeared in the Jewish press and need not be repeated here in detail, except to recall that immediately after the 'gentleman's' agreement between Sir Mark Sykes, authorized by the War Cabinet, and the Zionist leaders, cable facilities through the War Office, the Foreign Office and British Embassies, Legations, etc., were given to the latter to communicate the glad tidings to their friends and organizations in America and elsewhere, and the change in official and public opinion as reflected in the American press in favour of joining the Allies in the War, was as gratifying as it was surprisingly rapid.

"The Balfour Declaration, in the words of Prof. H. M. V. Temperley, was a 'definite contract between the British Government and Jewry' (*History of the Peace Conference in Paris*, vol. 6, p. 173). The main consideration given by the Jewish people (represented at the time by the leaders of the Zionist Organization) was their help in bringing President Wilson to the aid of the

Allies. Moreover, officially interpreted at the time by Lord Robert Cecil as 'Judea for the Jews' in the same sense as 'Arabia for the Arabs', the Declaration sent a thrill throughout the world. The prior Sykes-Picot Treaty of 1916, according to which Northern Palestine was to be politically detached and included in Syria (French sphere), was subsequently, at the instance of the Zionist leaders, amended (by the Franco-British Convention of December 1920, Cmd. 1195) so that the Jewish National Home should comprise the whole of Palestine in accordance with the promise previously made to them for their services by the British, Allied and American Governments, and to give full effect to the Balfour Declaration, the terms of which had been settled and known to all Allied and associated belligerents, including Arabs, before they were made public.

"In Germany, the value of the bargain to the Allies, apparently, was duly and carefully noted. In his *Through Thirty Years* Mr. Wickham Steed, in a chapter appreciative of the value of Zionist support in America and elsewhere to the Allied cause, says General Ludendorff is alleged to have said after the War that: 'The Balfour Declaration was the cleverest thing done by the Allies in the way of propaganda, and that he wished Germany had thought of it first' (vol. 2, p. 392). As a matter of fact, this was said by Ludendorff to Sir Alfred Mond (afterwards Lord Melchett), soon after the War. The fact that it was Jewish help that brought USA into the War on the side of the Allies has rankled ever since in German—especially Nazi—minds, and has contributed in no small measure to the prominence which anti-Semitism occupies in the Nazi programme."

(S. Landman : *Great Britain, The Jews and Palestine*, pp. 3-6)

It should be obvious that this is a document of capital importance, and yet the press has kept absolutely silent about it, and it has remained virtually unknown.

In order fully to understand the significance and importance of this confession, let us briefly resume the facts which led to its publication.

In 1917, the Allies were in distress and desperately needed American aid, but all their efforts to bring the United States into the war on their side had failed. It was then that the English commenced secret negotiations with the American Zionists. The latter proposed a deal: "If you will promise to hand over Palestine to us if you are victorious, we will guarantee to bring America into the war on your side." If America was brought into the war, it seemed

almost certain that Germany would be unable to resist the strength of the resulting coalition.

The deal was concluded, and the American Zionists fulfilled their part of the bargain, and brought the USA into the war, and by the celebrated Balfour Declaration, the British Government made Palestine into a national home for the Jews.

Up to this moment, everything seemed satisfactory. Both sides had fulfilled their engagements. However, England, in her distress, had not foreseen the consequences of this decision. The Arabs had not been consulted in the course of these negotiations, and it soon became apparent that while one party in the British Government was promising Palestine to the Jews, another branch of the same Government was promising the same land to the Arabs through the intermediary action of Lawrence of Arabia.

These two pledges were manifestly inconsistent, and if England on the one hand was obliged to accommodate the Jews, on the other she had important interests of her own in the Arab countries of the Near East. The Jews had one capital advantage. They were on the spot in both London and New York, whereas the Arabs were a long way away from the centre of action.

At first the British Government played the Jewish card to the full, and endeavoured to maintain a precarious balance between the Jews and the Arabs. At the time of the Balfour Declaration the Jews had promised that they would not infringe the rights of the Arab population, but the whole world knew that it was an impossible undertaking, and one which the Jews had no intention whatever of respecting.

Thus, to start with the British Government was in favour of establishing a Jewish community which would be built up by immigration, but confrontations with the Arabs rapidly became aggravated. Hitler's rise to power, and his anti-Jewish position, brought matters to boiling point. The British tried to calm the Jews, and cut down on the immigration of international Jews to Palestine. But how is one to reason with the Jews when they are in the grip of their messianic fervour? The influx of Jewish aliens drove the Arabs to flight from a country which they could legitimately consider as their own, since they had lived there for centuries, and they piled into refugee camps in which they have since eked out a miserable and hopeless existence. Massacres, such as at Deir Yassin, provoked a general exodus, and hundreds of thousands more fled to these camps. The Arab States, for their part, did nothing to ameliorate the condition of these unfortunate refugees, and consequently the situation became more and more explosive for the English, who

were confronted with a Jewish rebellion armed and supported by secret organizations such as the Irgoun and the Stern gang. Palestine was virtually in a state of war with the British.

It was under these conditions that the Anglo-American Zionists published a threatening warning to the British Government by means of the Landman document. Addressing the British Government as if they were speaking to an equal, they said in effect:

"You forget that you did not give us Palestine as an unsolicited gift (Balfour Declaration). It was handed over as the result of a secret bargain concluded between ourselves. We have scrupulously observed our part in bringing America into the war on your side. We call on you to fulfil your obligations in turn. You are aware of our power in the United States; take care that you do not attract the hostility of Israel, otherwise you will come up against grave international difficulties."

The publication of such a serious, revealing and compromising document was grossly imprudent, but it was also a calculated risk. Faced with the terrible menace of Hitler, the Jews were obliged to run risks, but on the other hand they were sure of themselves and of their power over the press in democratic countries. The document had to be published in order to effect the appropriate extortion from the British Government, but it was essential that it should on no account come to the knowledge of the general public. Consequently, the press in the western world kept silence, and the public remained in total ignorance of its existence. If it had been published at large, there might well have been a violent upheaval when it was discovered that the British and American Governments were acting under Israel's orders. The preparation of war against Hitler would have been singularly hindered. It is one thing to fight for the defence of one's own country. Fighting for Israel is another, much less inspiring prospect.

In conclusion, the Landman document demonstrates that the Jews are capable of exerting a considerable influence over public opinion and the American Government, and of bringing the USA into the war. It is a clear-cut case of a well organized minority orientating public opinion and manipulating it to its own liking. The Zionists themselves were surprised at the ease and rapidity with which they succeeded in overturning American opinion. It also shows that the world-wide influence of Jewish organizations vis-à-vis national governments is some considerable factor, since the former were able to discuss matters on an equal level with the Government

of the British Empire, and finally conclude a deal with the latter on a reciprocal basis.

Thus the secret history of America's entry into the war in 1917 on the side of the Allies is revealed as the secret history of the creation of a Jewish national home in Palestine—and both these events, it cannot be disputed, are of the utmost importance if one is to understand the evolution of the modern world.

Finally, it is a measure of the value of the press, which is supposed to be a source of objective information, and which is so avid for sensational news, that for thirty years it has maintained a total black-out on a document of absolutely capital importance, so that not so much as a whisper alluding to its existence has been made in the numerous histories of the First World War.

Doubtless, looking back, we may have reason to thank the Jews for pushing America into the war on our side in 1917, but in 1917 it was simply fortuitous that their interests coincided with those of the Allies. Today, in 1975, it is not so reassuring to learn that America's foreign policy is in the hands of a Jewish Zionist of German extraction, Dr. Henry Kissinger, the man who was first of all President Nixon's private adviser, and who was then promoted to Secretary of State.

II

VERSAILLES TO WORLD WAR II

Jewish power, which had been exercised secretly as regards Palestine, became more visible in the course of the peace negotiations which followed the defeat of Germany.

On 28th to 30th June 1917 a great international Masonic conference was held at the headquarters of the Grand Orient in Paris—an ultra-secret meeting of absolutely vital historic significance, at which nearly every Allied and neutral lodge was represented. The object of this reunion was to lay the foundations of a Peace Treaty, to prepare the creation of a future League of Nations, and to set out the general principles governing the new society which was to emerge after the war.

A commission was formed, and as a result of its labours Brother Lebey read out a resolution comprising thirteen articles which was to become a Charter of international Masonic doctrine.

Six months later, Brother Wilson, the President of the United States, supported by Brother House and his faithful Jewish advisers, Baruch and Brandeis, set out before the whole world his famous Fourteen Points, thirteen of which were taken in their entirety from the Masonic Congress of Paris in June 1917.

This fact may be unknown to the general public, but it is nevertheless indisputably true. We will now reproduce several typical passages from this Congress, taken from the book which I devoted to the whole subject in 1936, *La Société des Nations—Super-Etat Maçonnique*.

“This war,” said Brother Corneau, President of the Grand Orient of France, in his opening speech, “which was unleashed by the military autocracies, has become a formidable quarrel in which the democracies have organized themselves against the military powers”.

(Léon de Poncins, op. cit., p. 71)

“The great war of 1914, which was inflicted first on France, Belgium and Russia, then on Europe, and finally upon the whole world by German aggression, has itself gradually and continually brought into definition the character of the struggle, which is

revealed as one between two opposing principles: that of Democracy and of Imperialism. . . . From the violation of Belgian neutrality to the rising of the USA, and not excluding the Russian Revolution, there is not one fact which cannot be brought forward as a proof of this gigantic duel between two hostile principles.”

(Brother A. Lebey, *ibid.*, p. 76)

Incidentally, it is noteworthy that the Communist writer, H. Barbusse, wrote in *L'Humanité*, on 9th August 1914: “This is a social war which will witness a big step forward, perhaps the final one, in our cause. It is being waged against our everlasting enemies: militarism and imperialism, the sword, the book, and, I should add, the crown.” (H. Barbusse: *Paroles d'un combattant*, p. 9). Not long after the war, Mr. Coolidge, President of the United States, publicly stated in a speech at Hammond in 1927: “The chief question at stake in this formidable conflict was to decide which form of government was to predominate among the great nations of the world: the autocratic form or the republican form. Victory finally remained on the side of the people.”

(*Reuter*, London, 14th June 1927)

Thus the First World War, which commenced as a national war, was transformed by Freemasonry into a social war. But it was also a holy war.

“If ever there was a holy war, this is it, and we should never forget it.”

(Brother Lebey, *ibid.*, p. 89)

However, Freemasonry goes further than this, and uses victory in order to establish a new order in the world, based on the principles of the first revolution of 1789.

“It is the duty of Freemasonry at the close of the cruel drama now being played out, to make its great and humanitarian voice heard, and to guide the nations towards a general organization which will become their safeguard.”

(Brother Corneau, *ibid.*, p. 66)

Brother Meoni of Italy declared that “future humanity must be established on absolutely new foundations” (*ibid.*, p. 110).

Freemasonry is also revealed as the instrument which created the League of Nations, and which in turn became the very objective of the whole war. The minutes of an earlier meeting, at which preparations for the Congress in June were put in hand, state:

"The object of this Congress will be to investigate the means of elaborating the Constitution of the League of Nations" (ibid., p. 65).

At the Congress itself, Brother Corneau stated :

"Freemasonry, which labours for peace, intends to study this new organism, the League of Nations. Freemasonry will be the propaganda agent of this conception of universal peace and happiness" (ibid., p. 71). In Brother Lebey's opinion, "the League of Nations is the whole object of the war. The whole world realizes that a peace which was simply an instrument of diplomacy would be incomplete and that it should represent the first step towards the League of Nations" (ibid., p. 84).

Finally, President Wilson is openly acclaimed as the agent of Freemasonry in this work. On page 117 of my work, *La Société des Nations*, I quote the resolution which the Congress addressed to him :

"This Congress sends to Mr. Wilson, President of the United States, the homage of its admiration and the tribute of its recognition of the great services he has rendered humanity; declares that it is happy to collaborate with President Wilson in this work of international justice and democratic fraternity, which is Freemasonry's own ideal; and affirms that the eternal principles of Freemasonry are completely in harmony with those proclaimed by President Wilson for the defence of civilization and the liberty of peoples. . . ."

(Motion by Brother General Peigné)

Brother Lebey's communication to the Council of the Order on December 9th 1917 effectively sums up the whole situation :

"It is a question of knowing which is right : good faith or lies, Good or Evil, Liberty or Autocracy. The present conflict is the continuation of that which began in 1789, and one of these two principles must triumph or die. The very life of the world is at stake. Can humanity live in freedom; is it worthy of it? Or is it fated to live in slavery? That is the vital question in the present catastrophe, and all the democracies have given their answer.

"There is no question of retreat or compromise. In a war in which the opposing principles are so clearly and distinctly defined, no one could hesitate as to his duty. Not to defend our country would be to surrender the Republic. Our country and our

Republic, Socialism and the spirit of Revolution, these are inseparably bound together" (ibid., p. 62).

If the Treaty of Versailles was the work of Masonry, it was also a great Jewish victory. The principal European monarchies had been overthrown. The hated Tsarist regime had been swept away, and all the members of the imperial family who were in Russia at the time had been savagely massacred. Russia had been bled white, bound hand and foot and delivered to the bolsheviks whose principal leaders, apart from Lenin (who however was born of a Russian father and Jewish mother) and Stalin, were at that time Jewish.

Revolution raged throughout Europe, and without exception all the leaders were Jews.

Finally, the Jews had achieved their supreme conquest: Palestine.

As Leon Motzkin, president of the Committee of Jewish Delegations, stated in an article entitled "The Jewish minority and the League of Nations", which appeared in *Les Juifs-Témoignages de notre temps* (September 1933): "At Versailles, everything had been minutely prepared and nothing had been left to chance. That was a moment of triumph savoured in silence."

The leaders of the three big powers at Versailles, Wilson, Clemenceau and Lloyd George, were surrounded by Jewish advisers. The preponderance of Jewish influence in the course of the debates made a profound impression on certain observers, and their opinion has been summed up by the English writer, E. J. Dillon:

"It may seem amazing to some readers, but it is nonetheless a fact that a considerable number of Delegates believed that the real influences behind the Anglo-Saxon peoples were Semitic . . . they concluded that the sequence of expedients framed and enforced in this direction were inspired by the Jews, assembled in Paris for the purpose of realizing their carefully thought-out programme, which they succeeded in having substantially executed. . . . The formula into which this policy was thrown by the members of the Conference, whose countries it affected, and who regarded it as fatal to the peace of Eastern Europe, was this: 'Henceforth the world will be governed by the Anglo-Saxon peoples who, in turn, are swayed by their Jewish elements.'"

(Dr. E. J. Dillon: *The Peace Conference*, pp. 422, 423)

Such was their success that Motzkin wrote in a work glorifying the Jews: "despite appalling pogroms, which broke out first of all in Poland, and then in unheard-of proportions in the Ukraine, claiming the lives of tens of thousands of our people, the Jewish people

considered the post-war period as a messianic era. In these years 1919-1920 Israel clamoured for joy in central and eastern Europe and even more so in America."

(L. Motzkine, op. cit.)

But the era of messianic triumph was not to last for long. The streak of fatalism which has dogged the Jewish people throughout their long history struck again, bringing to naught the tenacious and persevering efforts of a century past, first of all in Russia and then in Germany.

In Russia, on Lenin's death it looked as if Trotsky was his successor designate, but suddenly and most unexpectedly a man appeared in his path: Stalin. The latter had only played a minor role in the October revolution, and nobody at that time would have accorded him much chance beside the big bolshevik leaders whose names were glorified in revolutionary annals. Nevertheless the struggle shortly resolved into a duel to the death between two giants who were perfectly well aware that neither would show the other any mercy; it was a fight between Trotsky's concept of permanent revolution and Stalin's idea of socialism in one country. Trotsky, the international Jew, the demoniacal spirit of world revolution, was set against Stalin, cold, pitiless, secret, the man of steel, who had escaped six times from Siberia, the Asiatic, the terrorist of Tiflis.

Against all expectations, Stalin emerged the victor. Trotsky went into exile in Turkey, France, Norway and Mexico, where he was finally assassinated, for Stalin's implacable hatred never forgave and never forgot. With the loss of their leader, all the communist Jews of the old bolshevik guard were eliminated, and more and more restrictive measures were taken against the Jewish population, which was eliminated from positions of command and influence. Today in Soviet Russia the Jews endure an even more severe regime and have even less power than under the Tsars—a strange and fantastic twist in the nemesis of history.

This initial catastrophe was soon followed by another, which was more swift, more brutal and more serious, in Germany. Between 1918 and 1934 the Jews were politically, economically, financially and intellectually the masters of Germany, which they had led into a state of chaos and total decomposition.

But suddenly there sprang up from nowhere a totally unknown individual who was to exercise an almost hypnotic fascination on the people. It was an almost unprecedented case in history. In 1933 Hitler became Chancellor and virtually the sole master of Germany, a master whom the whole people obeyed with blind confidence.

After a series of unheard-of triumphs, he finally led Germany to an appalling disaster, a sombre and bloody "twilight of the Gods".

When Hitler became both President and Chancellor of the Reich on 19th August 1933, the Jews reacted with extraordinary rapidity:

"In late July 1933, an International Jewish Boycott Conference (*New York Times*, 7th August 1933) was held in Amsterdam to devise means of bringing Germany to terms. Samuel Untermyer of New York presided over the Conference and was elected President of the World Jewish Economic Federation. Returning to America, Mr. Untermyer described the planned Jewish move against Germany as a 'holy war . . . a war that must be waged unremittingly.' (*New York Times*, 7th August 1933). . . . The immediately feasible tactic of the 'economic boycott' was described by Mr. Untermyer as 'nothing new', for 'President Roosevelt, whose wise statesmanship and vision are the wonder of the civilized world, is invoking it in furtherance of his noble conception of the relations between capital and labour'. Mr. Untermyer gave his hearers and readers specific instructions. . . ."

(J. Beaty: *The Iron Curtain Over America*, p. 62)

As may be seen, it was a veritable declaration of war on the part of international Judaism, supported by Roosevelt's administration in America, against Germany. As from this moment the Jews of the entire world undertook a campaign without respite to stir up war against Hitler.

The German Jewish writer, Emil Ludwig, who had prudently fled to Switzerland, set himself up as a spokesman for Jewry by the publication of a work which was launched with a great deal of to-do entitled *A New Holy Alliance*, in which he urged the conclusion of a new Holy Alliance between the three great democracies of the world.

"The foundations of a new Holy Alliance are neither Christian nor royal, and neither of the three founders of the former have any share in this one, for its principles are different following the philosophy of the times . . . the influence of the United States in this alliance will be the decisive factor. Because this new alliance is first and foremost designed as a threat and a deterrent, the chief role falls to America.

(E. Ludwig: *A New Holy Alliance*, p. 94)

"Roosevelt is watching. Since he has come to power he has made five major speeches which show that the United States stands with the democracies in the struggle against the dicta-

tors. . . . All countries may join the new Holy Alliance . . . among the Great Powers the Soviet Union will be the first (p. 101). The national philosophy will decide whether or not a state is to be admitted into the alliance . . . the alliance is directed against Germany, Italy and similar states which might adopt such principles at any moment . . . it issues its challenge in even more forceful language than that of the dictators" (p. 104), for "... the political aims of the century are: socialism as the national expedient, and the United States of Europe as the international policy. Is it possible to reach both goals without war? . . ." (p. 120).

It seems hardly likely, and Ludwig makes no attempt to disguise the fact, since he concludes his appeal with the words:

"Religions, philosophies, ideals have always been formulated and guarded by solitary thinkers. But they have always been defended by armed men, at the peril of their lives."

(E. Ludwig, *ibid.*, p. 123)

France's role in this campaign of provocation to war has been admirably depicted by a former Deputy, J. Montigny, who played an influential role in French politics, and who was closely involved in all these events:

"As the peril increased, people gradually became aware that there was a conspiracy to provoke a war in which up to then they had refused to believe. . . . At the Congress of Royan, the most diverse and opposing points of view met head on. Both militant intellectuals and those who were traditionally loyal to peaceful ideas were dumbfounded at Blum's volte-face, and began to discern in him the apostle of a new war of religion. The policy of force against Fascism was defended by his best friends, such as Zyromski, Rosenfeld and Louis Levy, but the Deputy for Hévédér retorted that in reality they were paying the cost of the absurd Treaty of Versailles, which had balkanized Europe . . . why could not the Treaty be revised. . . ?

"This was indeed to beg the question as to whether another war would have to be fought in order at all costs to uphold the defects of the Treaty of Versailles."

(J. Montigny: *Le Complot contre la Paix*, p. 307, Paris 1966)

Hitler, however, was preparing to invade central Europe.

"On 5th November 1937, he held a meeting of his Chiefs of Staff and some Ministers. His plan, as noted by his aide de camp, and which was later found by the Allies and published after the

war, was to seek the room that Germany needed for expansion in the East, the Ukraine, beginning with the annexation of Austria and Czechoslovakia. No date had yet been fixed, but everything was to be done to increase military strength (Chastenet: *Déclin de la Troisième*, p. 181, quoted by J. Montigny). The Führer also hoped that in France and Great Britain's present state of weakness, this plan could be achieved without embarking upon a war. He was not concerned about Italy, for he had laid on a magnificent reception for Mussolini in September . . . and on 6th November the Duce signed the anti-commintern pact which Germany had ratified with Japan in the previous year.

"Such was Hitler's plan for the East, and which henceforth, as the Siegfried line revealed on the ground, *comprised no further preliminary action against France*. Considering the state of military inferiority to which our country had sunk, and that we would be unlikely to conclude a rapid alliance with any Power, the delay which this plan afforded France was a gift from heaven . . . but the war party, which had decided the roles once and for all, had other ideas: in their scheme of things, France was to be in the avant-garde, supported, rather tardily, by England, and America was to be in the rear.

"In order to convince France that she had to shoulder this fearful task, she had to be deceived, and the truth was hidden from her. Political refugees from Germany and Italy were employed in this work. Heinrich Mann, for example, wrote an article in an important paper in which he stated: 'democrats who want to save civilization have no other choice: Hitler must go'."

(J. Montigny, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-104)

Paul Reynaud, speaking in the Chamber, told the nation that not only was France strong in herself, but that the British were undertaking "a gigantic rearmament, and behind the gigantic British rearmament is another which, believe me, will be a counsel of wisdom for the dictators, and that is the colossal rearmament of the United States" (J. Montigny, *op. cit.*, p. 104). But as if this was not enough, another argument was deployed to reassure the French. They were told that they would hardly have to fight, since Hitler would collapse of his own accord. This is what Thomas Mann actually stated in a letter published in the issue of June 19th 1937 of *Droit de vivre*, the organ of the International League against Antisemitism:

"There is no people in the world today less in a position to wage war than the Germans. They would have no allies, and

furthermore, the majority of the people are in a state of revolt. After the first defeat, the struggle would turn into a civil war. No, this war is impossible. Germany cannot wage it.

"Hence," continues Montigny, "arose the conviction, which was sustained until the fatal day, of the so-called Hitler's bluff."

(J. Montigny, *ibid.*, pp. 102-105)

"Daladier was won over to the Crusade of the democracies, but prudently considered that it would be unwise for France to step into the front rank of the firing line until she could be sure that Great Britain would be following behind her, whereas Blum, Reynaud and Mandel wanted to get the thing off the ground as soon as possible, since the Anglo-Saxons would be forced to follow suit.

"In August 1938, Bonnet, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, was entertained at Bordeaux, and at the dinner, Mandel, who was the Deputy for the department, sat next to the President of the Court of Appeal. After the meal, the magistrate went up to Bonnet and said: 'Mr. Mandel has just told me that there has got to be a war, and the sooner the better. . . .' Mr. Bonnet recalled that France was in a low state of military strength. 'I know that,' replied Mandel, 'but the democracies only prepare for war after they have declared them. Therefore we should begin them.'

"His plan was implacable but logical. He and his friends were indeed well aware that France would have a hard fight following a declaration of war, that she would lose many men, and might even be provisionally conquered. At the worst, she would be invaded, but she has an empire. Her army might have to capitulate, but the government could emigrate and continue the struggle from Africa . . . and later, after final victory, France could be resuscitated with whatever remained of the French. Such was the plan which had been thought out by Mandel, the brains behind Reynaud . . . and in 1940, supported by Lebrun, Jeanneney and Herriot, they did in fact urge the government to emigrate. This step, however, was opposed by Pétain and Weygand and parliamentary lobbies behind them.

"This plan may seem inhuman, but it was logical, whereas Daladier's view was unrealistic. There could be no compromise between Mandel's policy and the latter's."

(J. Montigny, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-148)

Finally, in September 1939 Germany attacked Poland, whereupon England, followed by France, declared war with a criminal lack of consideration, for both countries were totally unprepared.

They were to be rudely awoken. In less than three weeks Poland had been invaded and crushed. Soviet Russia, whose alliance had been considered militarily as indispensable, did a spectacular about-turn, and signed a pact with Germany, and meanwhile it rapidly became evident that the British Army needed a long period of preparation before it would be able to make any effective intervention, and the United States obstinately refused to enter the war on the side of France.

France, in a word, found herself in a very tight spot, and her state of military unpreparedness caused profound stupefaction among her people, who had been told that their army was the best in the world. In this position, and in order to prevent public opinion, and Parliament, from considering fresh overtures for peace, "Mandel and his friends realized that they would have to 'stir up the war' at all costs, in every direction, no matter what risks were involved".

(J. Montigny, *ibid.*, pp. 276-277)

To the general astonishment, having overrun Poland Hitler then offered to make peace, and made no demands upon the West except that he should be left free to act as he chose in the East. Daladier hesitated, but at this moment the war party, animated by Mandel, stepped in,

"and President Daladier received exhortations designed to bring him into line . . . Mandel, Reynaud and their friends stood guard over the President and brought formidable pressure to bear upon him. Provisionally they succeeded in stiffening his morale and in getting him back into line.

"Thus it was", as Montigny tells us, "that a secret brains-trust decided France's policy at a moment of supreme gravity for the nation, and imposed its will upon the President who in consequence refused to receive the offers of peace. But Daladier and Chamberlain were dreamers who might suffer a relapse, and accordingly Mandel told his friend General Spears, early in 1940, that 'the English should take command of the war, and since this role is apparently beyond Chamberlain, the sooner Churchill is in power, the better'."

(J. Montigny, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-283)

At the same time, Mandel was working to bring about Daladier's fall and Reynaud's rise to power, as the former Minister Lémery relates :

"At the end of February or the beginning of March 1940 Maurice de Rothschild invited me out to lunch outside Paris. He told me that Mandel would call and collect me. Paul Reynaud was present, and in the afternoon we discussed the political situation. Mandel made the point, in his habitual peremptory manner, that the war was languishing, the country was becoming discouraged, and that we would have to get out of the stagnation into which Daladier had relapsed and hand over power to Reynaud. I was asked what the Senate would do were this to happen. I replied . . . that it would accept a ministry of public safety comprising only a few ministers . . . if such a ministry could command a majority in the Chamber. A few days later this conversation was continued, this time at Maurice de Rothschild's house in Paris, and Mr. Duff Cooper was there. Again the conversation turned to the question of replacing Daladier with Reynaud, and of entering into a pact with the London government in order to affirm their joint determination to pursue the war to total victory.

"These two factors sought by Mandel were soon to be accomplished both in Paris and in London.

(J. Montigny, *op. cit.*, pp. 283-284)

"In Paris, Reynaud was elected Prime Minister by a majority vote! Several weeks later, in the middle of June, the Allied armies had been pierced at Sedan, cut through at Abbeville, surrounded at Lille and Dunkirk and defeated in Artois and Picardy. Their front had been broken in Champagne, the armies in Lorraine and Alsace, and the Maginot line, could no longer escape being encircled, the public administration left Paris, and three million French, Dutch and Belgian refugees had flooded out onto our roads, holding up military convoys. Suddenly stripped of her defenses, France fell into anarchy. At the meeting of the ministers outside Tours, General in Chief Weygand, supported by Marshal Pétain, declared that the army should choose between capitulation and an armistice, and that since the former course was contrary to honour and forbidden by the military code, conditions for an eventual armistice should be demanded from the enemy, provided that it was understood that they would only be accepted if they were honourable and would safeguard the freedom of our fleet and of our possessions overseas. The Council of Ministers were overwhelmed at being put on notice that they should study the conditions for an armistice, for the Franco-British agreement forbade separate armistices. This meant that the situation would have to be laid before Churchill, in order to obtain his assent in the

eventuality of such an armistice. The Council decided to invite the British Prime Minister to attend a conference with them on the following day, and the President of the Council was charged with transmitting this invitation. As he explained at the trial of Marshal Pétain, Paul Reynaud decided to see Churchill first of all alone, and not to tell him about the Council's invitation. He would only bring him to the conference when he had assured himself of his refusal.

"However, on the following day, Churchill, aware of the insufficient British contribution to the defence of France, and stirred by the situation of our country, withdrew all opposition, and after consulting with the ministers who had accompanied him, soon confirmed that he was well disposed towards this proposal.

(J. Montigny, *op. cit.*, pp. 284-285)

"The separate armistice became the least disastrous course for France to adopt, but it was contrary to the plans for the Crusade; furthermore, it would deprive the conspiring war party in France of the dramatic departure they envisaged, with a well orchestrated heroes' farewell upon embarkation for overseas. For if they were to remain in France, they would have to take action, and if they fled privately, their political careers would be compromised.

"The counter-attack rapidly developed. First of all, Churchill was allowed to leave without being told that the Council of Ministers were awaiting him, and subsequently the Council was informed that the Prime Minister had refused to agree to a separate armistice. Finally, a well-trusted messenger was sent to London to inform him of the falsehood, and to ask him to retract his previous consent, which had been kept secret.

"It was General de Gaulle, Reynaud's confidant, who was chosen to accomplish this mission. Towards the end of the afternoon, the Council of Ministers, deceived by their President's false report, decided to postpone the demand for an armistice. Mandel was happy, and told General Spears how the Council had been tricked . . . At Bordeaux, Reynaud resigned, and the former Minister of the Interior set out for Morocco on the steamer *Massilia*. During the trip he learnt with surprise that the armistice had been signed. He told his friends that when he arrived at Morocco he would try and set up a government in order to continue the war in North Africa with the French Fleet. As soon as he had disembarked he went to the British Embassy where, following a conversation, Churchill was notified of the situation, immediately summoned a Cabinet meeting, and decided to send out a Minister and a top

military authority to Casablanca at once with instructions to help Mandel in his rebellion. But the wheel of fortune had turned. General Noguès, who was resident in Morocco, and who was Commander in Chief of North Africa, decided to remain faithful to Marshal Pétain, put Mandel back on the *Massilia*, and dismissed Churchill's envoys.

"The latter event proves Mandel's pre-eminent position in the conspiracy.

"A year earlier Chamberlain had remarked that war is not a speculation with money, but with human beings, and it is impossible to calculate the disasters that would result from a conflict. Since then he has been overwhelmed by the warlike declarations which have assailed him from all sides, and he resigned himself to the war from the day when ideological passions managed to silence the voice of reason. . . .

"Daladier was in tow, and these were his thoughts, as he confessed to a parliamentary commission of enquiry: 'The French government threw itself into the war in desperation, thinking of the ruin that would be caused. It was convinced that France would only be at the avant-garde of a coalition army, that the war would last a long time, and that catastrophe would follow catastrophe' and he ended with William II's cry: 'I didn't want it.' He did not want it, but he did it, and he did it because he was manoeuvred by the crusaders. He often telephoned Roosevelt from the United States Embassy in Paris, and we have very weighty evidence as to the President's disposition at this time from the person of Mr. Joseph Kennedy, the father of the late President Kennedy. At that time Joseph Kennedy was Roosevelt's Ambassador in Great Britain and on friendly terms with the President, and in 1945 he held a conversation with Mr. Forrestal, then a member of the American government, which was so serious that the latter wrote it down in his Diary when he returned to his house. This Diary was published after the war, and here is the passage in question :

'27th December 1945

'Played golf today with Joseph Kennedy . . . Kennedy's view was that Hitler would have fought Russia without any later conflict with England if it had not been for Bullitt's (Ambassador to France) urging on Roosevelt in the summer of 1939 that the Germans must be faced down about Poland; neither the French nor the British would have made Poland a case of war if it had not been for the constant needling from Washington. Bullitt, he said, kept telling Roosevelt that the Germans wouldn't fight, Kennedy

that they would, and that they would overrun Europe. Chamberlain, he says, stated that America and the world Jews had forced England into the war. In his telephone conversation with Roosevelt in the summer of 1939 the President kept telling him to put some iron up Chamberlain's backside.' "

(The Forrestal Diaries, 1952, pp. 128-129)

"Chamberlain's opinion on the importance of Jewish pressure being brought to bear in favour of the war in the United States is confirmed by a report from Count Potocki, Polish Ambassador in Washington, who warned his government in 1939 of the campaign that was being organized in response to recent anti-semitic excesses of the nazis, a campaign in which various Jewish intellectuals took part, such as Bernard Baruch, Frankfurter, a Justice of the Supreme Court, Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, and others who were linked to Roosevelt by ties of personal friendship. This group of men, who held some of the highest posts in the American government, was very closely connected to International Jewry. Will Count Potocki be accused of antisemitism? The Jewish writer, Emmanuel Berl, wrote before the Munich crisis: 'All the Jews in politics hope for war and are urging towards it. Daily proof of this attitude is to be found in the corridors of the Chamber, not to mention Blum and Mandel's example. The Jewish community, as a political unit, has been and still is the life and soul of the war party'.

"This indeed is one of the truths of that time, but that is not to implicate the majority of the Jews, but only a well-organized international minority whose power lay in their wealth, their determination and in the key positions which they held in the democratic world.

"There is also another point of view to consider: the war leaders and statesmen of St. Petersburg, Vienna, Berlin and Paris who in 1914 yielded, with varying degrees of responsibility, to the temptation to hold a trial of strength—they had an excuse. They all believed that it would be a short war, and in fact no other alternative was even admitted.

"Hitler had the same hope in 1939. Stalin, on the other hand, was gambling on a long war of attrition which the leaders of the democracies and their military experts knew was inevitable. This is confirmed by Ambassador Bullitt's proposals to Count Potocki in November 1938, which were reported to the Polish government in the following terms:

'According to the information which the military experts had

supplied to Bullitt at the time of the crisis in the autumn of 1938, a war would last at least six years and would end with a complete disaster for Europe. There was no doubt whatever that in the end Soviet Russia would profit by it all.'

(Polish documents on the origin of the war)

"The United States was to benefit by it as well. It would be a mistake to imagine that Roosevelt was simply an idealist. Certain remarks he made to his son Elliot reveal that he was capable of realistic egoism. In the summer of 1941, some months before Pearl Harbour, Roosevelt, who had been re-elected in 1940, still refused Churchill's plea that he should enter the war. He explained his tactics to his son by drawing a comparison with a game of football: 'For the moment', he said, 'we are the reserve players sitting it out on the bench, and it is the Russians who have the field. . . . Our role is to follow the game, and before our markers (England and Russia) get tired, to join in for the final trial. *In this way we will come to the struggle all fresh. . . .*'

"Thus, in contrast to the French leaders, who were so eager to throw their country into the fight at the very start, Roosevelt, in the same way that Stalin had, sought to intervene in the war as late as possible, when all the others would be exhausted. At the same time, he did not hide from Churchill the prizes on which his eyes were fixed: the abolition of imperial tariffs, and a general move towards decolonization, which he hoped would greatly enrich his own country commercially. Thus in 1942, at the Casablanca Conference, he held out to the Sultan of Morocco, who took it, the bait of independence . . . matched by future economic relations between the two countries.

(J. Montigny, op. cit., pp. 289-290)

"Be that as it may, France, who declared war for fear of having it forced upon her one day, carried it on for fear she should have to recommence it, and thus courted disaster for fear of a future defeat."

(J. Montigny: *Le Complot contre la Paix*)

Incidentally, a staggering fact emerges from Montigny's book, as the following episode relates:

"At this period, de Monzie, the Minister of Public Works, made a short trip to London, and all his time was taken up with conferences with his opposite number in England. A few days after he had returned, he received a pressing invitation to dine with one

of the London clan of the Rothschilds. During the dessert, this lady said to him :

" 'I believe that you have just returned from London, Minister?

" 'Yes', he replied.

" 'Do you realize that you have been regrettably neglectful? You are aware of the importance of the head of our family there, and you never went to see him.'

" 'I am sorry that I was unable to do so, but I was too busy during my short stay.'

" 'And yet Mr. Paul Reynaud, who is just as busy as you are when he is in London, never fails to make this visit.'

" 'I had been invited to be given this lesson', de Monzie concluded, 'and thereafter I had no more illusions: Daladier's heir presumptive had already been chosen, and in due course Lebrun would be notified.' "

(J. Montigny, *op. cit.*, p. 227)

In other words, at the height of the war, the London Rothschilds were able to decide the choice of the French Prime Minister. Such an incredible piece of information goes without comment.

Three years earlier, Montigny had admirably depicted the atmosphere of a war of religion which was to impregnate the Second World War, in a speech at the Chamber on July 31st 1936:

"Our foreign policy", he stated, "has succeeded in creating two opposing power blocs in Europe. The serious thing is that these two blocs not merely represent political and economic combinations; more and more it is emerging that the struggle is between political doctrines, social systems and philosophical conceptions, and their mutual antagonism has only been increased by the case of Ethiopia, the Spanish and French elections, and the Spanish civil war.

"The conflict, which rises with ever-increasing passion, is between ideas of collective security and bilateral agreements, racism and internationalism, Hitlerism and communism, and finally, between Fascism and democracy.

"From this point of view, the situation in Europe is worse than in 1913, because it is no longer a case, as it was then, simply of opposing blocs; we are confronted with self-excommunicating ideas. The other side is not merely regarded as a rival or an adversary; he is a heretic whose criminal faith should be destroyed. Europe is permeated with the atmosphere of a war of religion, which is engendering the spirit of a crusade.

"How else is one to explain certain sudden changes which have

come about? Those circles which formerly most ardently sought peace, today unhesitatingly demand a war effort and human sacrifice as soon as it is a question of supporting what in their eyes is a holy cause, be it yesterday against Italian Fascism, or today against Spanish Fascism, or tomorrow against the Hitlerian heresy. The moment that it is allowed to become patriotic, the most antimilitary party immediately exalts the army with unprecedented fervour.

"That is where Europe has got to, after two centuries of struggle towards reason and progress, and the tragedy is that this progress has placed an unlimited power of massacre at the service of passions which belong to the middle ages."

(J. Montigny : *Le Complot contre la Paix*, p. 307)

III

TERROR BOMBING AND THE DESTRUCTION OF DRESDEN

When the Nuremberg Trials opened, the whole world expected that the German bombing of defenceless towns would be one of the main arguments in the case for the prosecution. However, to the general surprise, the question was not even raised.

In the opinion of every western country, the matter was quite clear-cut, and any discussion was ruled out. The Germans had commenced a campaign of terror bombing directed against defenceless towns and civilian populations which could in no way be classified as military objectives: Rotterdam, London, Coventry, etc. Sow the wind and you will reap a tempest. As the Anglo-Saxons progressively got control of the sky, the terrifying weapon of aerial bombardment rebounded against the Germans, and all their big towns were reduced to ashes, in an apocalyptic outburst of bloodshed.

But there was no doubt in anyone's mind that the initial responsibility for this crime lay with the Germans, and that they should have had to answer for it at the trial of the war criminals at Nuremberg. Why, in that case, was the whole matter passed over in silence?

Today we can at last produce the stupefying answer to that question. It is one of the biggest and most strictly kept secrets of the war, which the British and American Governments have successfully guarded behind a total blackout for over twenty years. Briefly, the accepted version which was put out by the Allied propaganda organs is completely false, and the British Government has coldly and shamelessly told a lie.

This is not to say that we intend to absolve Hitler's Government of all responsibility in the conduct of the aerial war, for it is certain that had he been able, Hitler would not have hesitated to destroy the English towns, but it is also true that the Anglo-Saxons have not got a clean conscience in the matter.

Let us briefly resume the sequence of events which led to the appalling catastrophe of the terror bombardments in the Second World War, starting at 1923. At this period, the Air Force in

Britain was already developing as a separate service, contrary to France and Germany. When the question of rearmament arose, the discussion turned to the use that would be made of aviation in war-time, and consequently, the type of aircraft that would be required. Two theories were under consideration. Officers of the classic military school of thought held that the aircraft was a long-range strike weapon whose role lay in attacking the enemy army. But Air Marshal Trenchard, who was not handicapped by antique military traditions nor by moral scruples, held that aircraft could be put to more efficient and deadly use by deliberately attacking industrial centres and urban agglomerations, which were less difficult to reach and less dangerous targets. He held that its role should be to pursue the destruction of the enemy nation, whereas the Army maintained that it should pursue the destruction of the enemy army.

Such concepts, briefly, heralded a return to the days of Gengis Khan and Attila, and genocide again became an official object of war.

In 1934 England began a massive rearmament programme, the main effort of which was concentrated on the aviation industry. Trenchard's ideas prevailed and England began the construction of an armada of heavy, long-range bombers for the purposes of what was called "strategic bombing". In other words, instead of building machines such as the German stukas—dive-bombers whose role was to attack precise military objects, such as tanks—the English were building machines with a heavy pay-load designed to throw a carpet of bombs over vast areas of towns and industrial centres, and which were later imitated by the American flying fortresses.

Aerial bombing went through three successive phases during the Second World War. Firstly, between 3rd September 1939 and 11th May 1940 the air forces of the two sides adhered to the conventional regulations of war adopted by civilized countries, and only bombed military objectives. But on 11th May 1940, the day after the German offensive was unleashed on the western front, the British Government adopted a new definition as to what constituted military objectives. Until that time, any building or enterprise contributing directly or indirectly to the war effort had been considered as a military objective. But on that day, for the first time, a squadron of eighteen British bombers undertook a raid in the interior of Germany against a railway station and part of a town which were not strictly speaking military objectives. It was obvious that such a definition permitted the virtually unlimited extension of bombing, since every town and village contains buildings which indirectly can be made to serve the war effort.

For four months the High Command directed more and more violent and extensive so-called "strategic" bombings against Germany. Then on 16th December 1940 a squadron of one hundred and thirty-four heavy bombers conducted what was described as the first "strategic" bombing against the town-centre of Mannheim, without any pretence that this was striking at some military objective. At this time Britain did not have sufficient heavy bombers to make these attacks really effective. What, then, was their purpose? There was, it is true, an accessory reason. They served to train the crews and perfect techniques in preparation for the later, massive raids. But the real reason is so incredible, and so fantastic that I would not dare to assert it if it had not already been officially made public by the British Government.

In April 1961 there appeared a small work under a seemingly abstract title, *Science and Government*. The author, Sir Charles Snow, is a scientist and a writer, and in one simple paragraph he revealed for the first time a truth of absolutely capital importance.

"Early in 1942 . . . he (Lindemann) produced a Cabinet paper on the strategic bombing of Germany . . . it described in quantitative terms the effect on Germany of a British bombing offensive in the next eighteen months (approximately March 1942–September 1943). The paper laid down a strategic policy. The bombing must be directed essentially against German working-class houses. Middle-class houses have too much space round them, and so are bound to waste bombs; factories and 'military objectives' had long since been forgotten, except in official bulletins, since they were much too difficult to find and hit. The paper claimed that—given a total concentration of effort on the production and use of bombing aircraft—it would be possible, in all the larger towns of Germany (that is, those with more than 50,000 inhabitants) to destroy 50 per cent of all houses."

(Sir Charles Snow: *Science and Government*, pp. 47–48)

"The Air Ministry fell in behind the Lindemann paper. The minority view was not only defeated, but squashed. The atmosphere . . . had just the perceptible smell of a witch hunt (p. 50) . . . Churchill and Lindemann really did work together on all scientific decisions and on a good many others, as one mind. In his early days as grey eminence to the Prime Minister, Lindemann made it obvious, by holding his interviews in 10 Downing Street, or by threatening Churchill's intervention. Very soon this was not necessary. Bold men protested to Churchill about Lindemann's influence, and were shown out of the room. Before long everyone

in official England knew that the friendship was unbreakable, and that Lindemann held real power.”

(Sir C. Snow, *ibid.*, p. 64)

This brief revelation created a feeling of profound stupor in England. On several occasions important people had questioned the government as to whether the RAF was terror-bombing the civilian population of Germany, and on each occasion the Secretary for Air, Sir Archibald Sinclair, had replied that it had never issued such orders, and that the bombing raids were directed exclusively against military objectives. Naturally, there had been an inevitable number of civilian losses during the course of these operations.

When Snow's book appeared in 1961, the British public expected an immediate and forthright contradiction from the government, but no such denial was forthcoming. However, six months later the truth was finally revealed in an official publication, *The Strategic Air Offensive against Germany*, published by HMSO, which contains the most exact details of the history of the Allied bombing campaign against Germany during the Second World War.

In his book, *Advance to Barbarism* (p. 184), F. J. P. Veale states:

“In passing it may be observed that the question which air offensive was a reprisal for which had now long ceased to be a subject for dispute. As early as 1953 HM Stationery Office published the first volume of a work *The Royal Air Force, 1939-1945* entitled *The Fight at Odds*, a book described as ‘officially commissioned and based throughout on official documents which had been read and approved by the Air Ministry Historical Branch.’ The author, Mr. Dennis Richards, states plainly that the destruction of oil plants and factories was only a secondary purpose of the British air attacks on Germany which began in May 1940. The primary purpose of these raids was to goad the Germans into undertaking reprisal raids of a similar character on England. Such raids would arouse intense indignation in Britain against Germany and so create a war psychosis without which it is impossible to carry on a modern war. Mr. Dennis Richards writes (p. 122): ‘The attack on the Ruhr, in other words, was an informal invitation to the Luftwaffe to bomb London.’”

It could not have been phrased more clearly, or more cynically, and this machiavellian trap functioned to perfection.

In March 1942 the fatal decision was taken to adopt the Lindemann plan, and this step marked the beginning of the third and final phase in the bombing strategy of the Allies. It was to weigh heavily on the future of the war, and of the whole world in general.

Once the principle of terror-bombing was accepted, it was earnestly pursued as a war policy and carried out with increasing intensity up to 1944 and the opening weeks of 1945. As a result, there took place the appalling bombardments of Hamburg (27–28th July 1943), Lübeck and Cologne, culminating in a nightmare of apocalyptic proportions, the bombing of Dresden on 13th February 1945.

The bombing of Dresden is a date that will never die in the annals of history, for in sheer horror it surpasses the destruction of either Hamburg, Hiroshima or Tokyo.

It was one of the most atrocious crimes of the Second World War, and yet even as an act it served absolutely no purpose whatever.

Dresden, the capital of Saxony, was a famous town, rich in artistic and architectural treasures of every description. Normally, it had a population of some 600,000 inhabitants, but in February 1945 the Soviet armies were spreading out far and wide across eastern Prussia, Silesia and Roumania, leaving in their wake a trail of violations and atrocities worthy of the hordes of Attila and Gengis Khan. Dresden was surrounded with refugees, the vast majority of whom were women and children, who were fleeing from the horrors of the Russian invasion. There were more than half a million in the town, and it was at this precise moment that the Anglo-American High Command chose to hit Dresden with perhaps the heaviest bombardment of the whole war. The raid had no military object at all, except perhaps to show the Russians that the Allies were going to do everything in their power to help them.

On the night of 13th and 14th February 1945, 1,400 English bombers attacked the town in continuous waves, dropping 650,000 incendiary bombs, alternating with hundreds of huge explosive bombs, and the following morning 1,350 American Liberator flying fortresses returned to the attack to find the city a prey to a terrifying new phenomenon—Dresden was a fire-storm, and winds of several hundred miles an hour swept up the flames so high that they threatened the bombers and could be seen over 200 miles away.

On the following night, the Lancasters took off again for the neighbouring town of Chemnitz.

"This time", says David Irving, in his *Destruction of Dresden* (p. 155), "less attempt was made to veil the real nature of the target city. Curiously, although Chemnitz as a city possessed many obviously military and legitimate targets—the tank works, the large textile and uniform-making factories, and one of the largest locomotive repair depots in the Reich, in at least two widely separated squadrons of two Bomber Groups an almost

identical wording of the briefing was used by the Intelligence officers. Thus No. 1 Group crews were informed :

Tonight your target is to be Chemnitz. We are going there to attack the refugees who are gathering there, especially after last night's attack on Dresden.

No. 3 Group crews were briefed :

Chemnitz is a town some thirty miles west of Dresden, and a much smaller target. Your reasons for going there tonight are to finish off any refugees who may have escaped from Dresden. You'll be carrying the same bombloads, and if tonight's attack is as successful as the last, you will not be paying any more visits to the Russian front."

Further on, Irving writes :

"The ferocity of the USSAF daylight raid of 14th February had finally brought the people to their knees. The sky had been overcast and the bombs dropped by the Flying Fortresses were widely scattered.

"But it was not the bombs which finally demoralized the people: compared with the night's bombardment by two- and four-ton 'blockbusters', the American 500-pound General Purpose bombs must have seemed very tame; it was the Mustang fighters, which suddenly appeared low over the city, firing on everything that moved, and machine-gunning the columns of lorries heading for the city. One section of the Mustangs concentrated on the river banks, where masses of bombed-out people had gathered. Another section attacked targets in the Grosser Garten area.

"Civilian reaction to these fighter-strafting attacks, which were apparently designed to complete the task outlined in the air commanders' Directives as 'causing confusion in the civilian evacuation from the East', was immediate and universal; they realized that they were absolutely helpless . . . British prisoners who had been released from their burning camps were among those to suffer the discomfort of machine-gunning attacks on the river banks and have confirmed the shattering effect on morale. Wherever columns of tramping people were marching in or out of the city they were pounced on by the fighters, and machine-gunned or raked with cannon fire. It is certain that many casualties were caused by this low-level strafing of the city, which later became a permanent feature of American attacks."

(D. Irving, *op cit.*, pp. 180-181)

Three-quarters of a million incendiary bombs were dropped on Chemnitz, but the sky was very clouded and the town was defended

by anti-aircraft installations, unlike Dresden, and accordingly the results were less spectacular and less frightful.

The general attack had lasted for thirty-six hours without ceasing, and the massacre had been horrifying. The town had been choked with refugees, but the heat was so great that most of the bodies and even the buildings had been liquefied. It is impossible to estimate the number of dead with precision, but it is somewhere between one hundred and twenty and two hundred thousand. The figure of one hundred and thirty-five thousand would seem nearest to the truth. It was the greatest single massacre in all European history, and on this level at least, the Lindemann plan had proved its efficiency, although, as we shall see, it was a failure in every other aspect. The area of total destruction covered three thousand acres. The fires lasted for a week. Police and troops cordoned off the town centre and anyone seen pillaging was shot on sight. What remained of the corpses was piled up on immense pyres hastily constructed out of burnt beams, and these pyres burnt unceasingly for weeks. The photographs which were subsequently published bear witness to a horror which is almost beyond endurance.

On February 16th, however, SHAEF published a triumphant communiqué. On that day, as David Irving tells us:

"... the air commanders entrusted an RAF Air Commodore seconded to SHAEF as ACS2 (Intelligence) officer, to address a press conference . . . On air activities generally, with particular reference to those of the enemy. . . .

"According to the American Official History, the new Allied plan that he outlined was to 'bomb large population centres and then to attempt to prevent relief supplies from reaching and refugees from leaving them—all part of a programme to bring about the collapse of the German economy.'

"In the course of a reply to a question put to him by one correspondent, the Air Commodore recalls having apparently referred to German allegations of 'terror-raids'—he was currently engaged in Intelligence on German operations—and, once spoken, the word remained in the mind of the correspondent of the Associated Press. Within an hour, the AP correspondent's dispatch was being put out from Paris Radio and being cabled to America for inclusion in the next morning's newspapers."

Here is the text of this dispatch:

"Allied air chiefs have made the long-awaited decision to adopt terror-bombings of German population centres as a ruthless expedient of hastening Hitler's doom. More raids such as those

recently carried out by heavy bombers of the Allied air forces on residential sections of Berlin, Dresden, Chemnitz and Kottbus are in store for the Germans for the avowed purpose of heaping more confusion on Nazi road and rail traffic, and to sap German morale. The all-out air war on Germany became obvious with the unprecedented daylight assault on the refugee-crowded capital, with civilians fleeing from the Red tide in the East.

"Thus, for one extraordinary moment, what might be termed the 'mask' of the Allied bomber commands appeared to have slipped. The dispatch—which was of course a highly tendentious version of the Air Commodore's more moderate wording—was broadcast throughout liberated France and printed across America as front-page news; not only RAF Bomber Command—whose own air offensive had long been viewed with suspicion in the United States—but also their own US Strategic Air Forces were now delivering terror-raids on German civilians. At the time that the news broke in America, many people had only just finished listening incredulously to a radio message beamed across the Atlantic by German transmitters in which the big Berlin raid of 3rd February by the American bombers was condemned."

(D. Irving: *The Destruction of Dresden*, pp. 218–219)

David Irving continues:

"Now the vicious propaganda from Berlin was apparently being confirmed officially by an SHAEF announcement; British listeners were fortunately spared this dilemma: the British Government, which received news of the SHAEF press conference at 7.30 p.m. on the evening of 17th February, imposed a total press veto on publication of the dispatch soon after.

"The news was brought to General Eisenhower and General Arnold—both were gravely disturbed not only that the story had received such wide coverage, but also that an American air offensive which was, as they thought, directed only against precision military objectives, was being so manifestly misrepresented. General Arnold cabled Spaatz to check whether in fact there was any significant distinction between blind bombing by radar on military targets in urban areas, and 'terror' bombing, such as the SHAEF communiqué—as reported by Associated Press—claimed the Americans were now indulging in. General Spaatz replied, perhaps a shade cryptically, that he had not departed from the historical American policy in Europe—not even in the cases of the 3rd February Berlin raid or the 14th February Dresden raid. This discussion and its subsequent explanation

satisfied General Arnold and the controversy was allowed to subside.

"General Spaatz had clearly eluded the onus of the responsibility for the Dresden raids and their consequences, but only just in time; his reassurance that the USSAF was attacking only military objectives, as always, pacified both Arnold and Eisenhower.

"The German Government, however, aware, in a way that neither the outside world nor indeed the German public could be, of what had really occurred in the Saxon capital, had no intention of relinquishing such a meaty propaganda detail. The very manner in which the report had been issued by SHAEF and then—as it was later—hastily stopped, the way in which the British Government alone had clamped a total ban on its publication, suggested that there was more to the Associated Press dispatch, which had by now reached Berlin through Sweden, than was superficially evident."

(D. Irving, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-220)

On the military level, the matter would appear to have ended with the destruction of Dresden and with the massacre of approximately 135,000 civilian refugees, but it was to have profound repercussions in international diplomatic circles.

The German radio had already mentioned it, but there were more important developments than this. Foreign and neutral, particularly Swiss and Swedish, nationals, had witnessed the crime, and their accounts of the horrifying massacre they had witnessed were published in the world press. Public opinion rose in a volume which surprised the British and American Governments, and in England a number of eminent people persisted in demanding from the government an answer to a number of precise and highly embarrassing questions: Dr. Bell, Bishop of Chichester, the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, Deans of St. Paul's, Lord Hankey, who subsequently wrote a famous work entitled *Politics, Trials and Errors*, and the Labour Member of Parliament, Richard Stokes.

"On 6th March the German propaganda campaign achieved in London a success it could hardly have hoped for before: the occasion was the first full-scale debate on the air offensive since February 1944 when the Bishop of Chichester had raised the whole issue of area bombing of civilian targets in Europe.

"This time, when Mr. Richard Stokes took the floor at 2.43 p.m., he had the advantage of a British public more sympathetic towards the question than previously. Although Dr. Bell, the Bishop of Chichester, is known to have received hundreds of letters sup-

porting his stand in the House of Lords, at the time of his speech in February 1944, he had been debating at the height of the Baby Blitz, and London opinion had been against him.

"Now in March 1945, with the end of the war heaving into sight, and with only the V2 threat hanging over it, the public was more vulnerable to the horrific descriptions of the consequences of these raids now being retailed in the British daily newspapers by correspondents in Geneva and Stockholm. As Mr. Stokes rose to speak, the Secretary for Air, Sir Archibald Sinclair, pointedly rose from his seat and left the Chamber; he refused to be drawn back, even when Stokes called attention to his absence. Richard Stokes was therefore obliged to commence his speech, one of the most telling in the history of the air offensive against Germany, without as it were the most prominent witness for the defence present.

"In his speech he returned to the theme he had been representing consistently since 1942; he was not convinced by the Minister's repeated insistence on the precision of Bomber Command's attacks; he also doubted the advantage of what he announced he would call 'strategic bombing', and commented that it was very noticeable that the Russians did not seem to indulge in 'blanket bombing'. He could see the advantage of their being able to say that it was the Western capitalist states which had perpetrated all these dirty tricks, while the Soviet Air Force had limited its bombing activities to what Mr. Stokes called 'tactical bombing'. In making this observation he was displaying remarkable prescience as the post-war years have demonstrated.

"The question was whether at this stage of the war the indiscriminate bombing of large population centres was a wise policy; he read to the House an extract from a report in the *Manchester Guardian*—based on a German telegraphic dispatch—which contained the remark that tens of thousands of Dresdeners were now buried under the ruins of the city, and that even an attempt at identification of the victims was proving hopeless.

"Stokes observed caustically that it was strange that the Russians seemed to be able to take great cities without blasting them to pieces, and added a question which clearly set even the Prime Minister's mind at work. 'What are you going to find', he asked, 'with all the cities blasted to pieces and with disease rampant? May not the disease, filth and poverty which will arise be almost impossible either to arrest or to overcome? I wonder very much whether it is realized at this stage. When I heard the Minister (Sir Archibald Sinclair) speak of the crescendo of destruction, I

thought: what a magnificent expression for a Cabinet Minister of Great Britain at this stage of the war'.

"Stokes called attention to the Associated Press dispatch from the SHAEF Headquarters, and indeed read it out in full, thereby putting it on record for posterity; he asked once again the question he had asked so often before: Was terror-bombing now part of official Government policy? If so, then why was the SHAEF decision released and then suppressed? And why was it that in spite of the reports having been broadcast from Radio Paris, printed throughout America, and even being relayed back to the German people, the British people 'are the only ones who may not know what is being done in their name?' It was complete hypocrisy to say one thing and do another. In conclusion Mr. Stokes asserted that the British Government would live to rue the day that it had permitted these raids, and that the raids would stand for all time as 'a blot on our escutcheon'.

"One curious aspect of the SHAEF dispatch riddle remained unsolved: When the Associated Press dispatch was circulated and objections were raised in London to its publication, the first reaction from SHAEF was that it could not be suppressed, as it *represented official SHAEF policy* (Irving's italics). To this remark, backed up by the promise of documentary evidence, Sir Archibald Sinclair felt obliged to reply: the report certainly was not true, and Mr. Stokes might take that from him.

"Thus ended the last war-time debate on Bomber Command's policy; the British Government had been able to safeguard its secret from the day that the first area raid had been launched on Mannheim on 16th December 1940, right up to the end of the war.

"The creation of a scapegoat who could convincingly be blamed for the brutality of the bombing offensive presented few difficulties, now that the prime necessity for the bomber weapon was past. . . . On 28th March the Prime Minister signed a minute on the subject of the continued air offensive against German cities, and addresed it to his Chiefs of Staff: he was clearly deeply impressed by reports reaching the Government of the shock waves still coursing through the civilized world about the attacks on the Eastern population centres:

"It seems to me, he wrote, that the moment has come when the question of bombing German cities simply for the sake of increasing the terror, though under other pretexts, should be reviewed. Otherwise we shall come into control of an utterly ruined land. We shall not, for instance, be able to get housing

materials out of Germany for our own needs because some temporary provision would have to be made for the Germans themselves. The destruction of Dresden remains a serious query against the conduct of Allied bombing. I am of the opinion that military objectives must henceforward be more strictly studied in our own interests rather than that of the enemy . . . and I feel the need for more precise concentration upon military objectives. . . .

"This was indeed a remarkable document. Two possible interpretations were placed upon it at the time by those who learned of its contents: either the minute was hastily penned in the heat and turmoil of great events, and at a time when the Prime Minister was under considerable personal strain, simply recording the lessons learned from the aftermath of Dresden; or it could be construed as a carefully-phrased attempt at burdening for posterity the responsibility for the Dresden raids on to his Chiefs of Staff, and, perhaps more appositely, on to Bomber Command and Sir Arthur Harris.

"Sir Robert Saundby, Harris's Deputy at High Wycombe . . . recalls clearly the surprise and consternation felt by the Air Staff at what they felt to be implied by the Prime Minister: that he had been deliberately misled by his military advisers. What the Air Staff found most surprising, Saundby later related, was the suggestion that Bomber Command had been waging a purely terror offensive on its own initiative, 'though under other pretexts'.

"To the Chiefs of Staff, said Saundby, it looked as though it was an attempt on the Prime Minister's part to pretend that he had never ordered, or even advocated, that sort of thing. It was felt that it was not a fair picture of the Prime Minister to put on record, in view of what he had previously said and done. He was rather given to these impetuous flashes which were all very well in conversation, but not in a written minute. It might have led people to suppose that the Prime Minister himself had been misled by his military advisers to acquiescing in a policy of terror-bombing, because they had dressed it up in 'military' garments.

"In the face of the Air Staff's objection to his first minute, the Prime Minister wrote a second one, more circumspectly worded than the first. It omitted any direct reference either to Dresden on the one hand, or to the advantage of terror-bombing to the enemy on the other.

"The Prime Minister in his memoirs deals with the tragedy of the Dresden massacre in the following words: we made a heavy

raid later in the month on Dresden, then a centre of communications of Germany's Eastern front. No attempt was made to depict the scale of the personal tragedies inflicted on the city, nor the controversial background and consequences to the raid."

In reply to a criticism of his role in Bomber Command in 1960, Sir Arthur Harris stated:

"The strategy of the bomber force which Earl Attlee criticizes was decided by HM Government, of which he (Attlee) was for most of the war a leading member. The decision to bomb industrial cities for morale effect was made, and in force, before I became C-in-C Bomber Command.

"No Commander-in-Chief", comments Irving, "would have been authorized to make such decisions, however adept he may have proved himself in their execution."

(D. Irving: *The Destruction of Dresden*, pp. 225-233)

To conclude our analysis of this policy of terror-bombing aimed at the destruction of civilian populations, we must briefly examine two points.

First of all, there is the question of responsibility. Despite all the precautions taken by the British Government and by SHAFE in order to hide the real truth for as long as possible, the truth did in the end filter out and the bombing of Dresden raised indignant reactions in the civilized world. Surprised at their unexpected violence, the Government sought a scape-goat in the person of Air Marshal Sir Arthur Harris. But the men who were indirectly responsible for the plan behind the scenes were the real culprits, and they were, firstly, Lindemann, who drew up the plan, and then Churchill, who accepted it, and finally the heads of the Government and of SHAFE, all of whom approved the policy at the same time as denying in public that it was being carried out.

Finally, it remains to consider the efficacy of the terror-bombing campaign. Although it is difficult to arrive at exact figures, the bombing raids on German towns is estimated to have caused six hundred thousand deaths and eight hundred thousand wounded. The blitz on London, which lasted several months, caused fifteen thousand civilian deaths and destroyed five hundred acres of buildings; by contrast the Allied raid on Hamburg caused fifty thousand deaths, and the bombing of Dresden, which lasted uninterrupted for thirty-six hours, killed one hundred and thirty-five thousand people and destroyed more than three thousand acres of buildings.

If the secret intent of these raids was an act of vengeance to satisfy

the Jews by killing the greatest possible number of civilians, they may be regarded as a success. But they were a total failure as regards the following two vital points:

In the first instance, the promoters of the policy of terror-bombing intended that it should be used as a means to force the German population to sue for mercy, or even to provoke a rising against Hitler. On the contrary, it had the completely opposite effect, and only served to galvanize the Germans into a greater spirit of resistance and determination to stand by their Fuhrer.

The revelation of the Morgenthau and Kauffman plans, the Declaration of Casablanca, which demanded the unconditional surrender of Germany, the fatal Yalta Agreement, the unconditional support given to the Russians by Roosevelt and Eisenhower, and finally the terror-bombing raids—all these factors served to convince the German people that defeat would spell total annihilation of their country, and accordingly the whole people rose up with a desperate energy and fought to an absolute standstill. As a result, the war was unnecessarily prolonged for a further utterly profitless year, except that hundreds of thousands more men met their death, destruction took place on an appalling scale, but most important of all, this delay enabled the Russians to occupy half of Europe and thereby constitute a permanent menace to western civilization.

Secondly, the bombing raids were supposed to lead indirectly to the destruction of the German war industries. But one of the things which astonished the Allies when they occupied Germany after the war was to find that her industrial power had hardly been affected, for in this field they had accomplished veritable prodigies, and it is a fact that their war production never ceased to rise between 1939 and 1945. Following the terrible raid on Hamburg, war production in the area fell by fifty per cent, but only one month later it had risen to its original level. Five days after the destruction of Dresden the Germans had reopened the railway lines, which were used principally to evacuate the wounded and refugees from the Russian front.

Here is another significant detail. The tonnage of submarines launched in 1944 was greater than that of two years earlier. But in March 1945, when Germany was already partially invaded and was being bombed almost continuously day and night, more than 28,000 tons of submarines were being built monthly, as against 30,000 tons for the whole of 1941.

Again, in 1944 the aircraft industry produced more machines than at any time in the war: 40,593, as against 10,247 in 1940 and 12,401 in 1941.

Two factors considerably hampered the German war effort. They were terribly short of food and fuel, whereas the Allies could draw on abundant supplies of either, and secondly, towards the end of the war the Allies adopted a specialized pattern of bombing raids designed to destroy certain factories of absolutely vital importance: ball-bearing industries, petrol refineries, scientific research laboratories and test workshops for new engines such as the V1 and V2 at Peenemunde.

It is obvious that without ball-bearings and petrol one can neither manufacture nor put in service the aircraft, tanks and submarines that are indispensable for modern warfare. If this policy of specialized raids had been adopted from the outset it would have achieved far greater effect than the terror-bombing, and as a result the war would have been considerably shortened.

But those responsible for American policy seem to have been determined to prolong the war to allow the Russians to occupy that half of Europe which had been promised to them by Roosevelt at Yalta.

The German writer Karl Bartz has very clearly summed up the question of the efficacy of the terror-bombing in his book *Quand le ciel était en feu*:

"One of the key industries at the heart of all the German activity was the production of ball-bearings. If these factories had been destroyed, inevitably Germany would have been paralysed. No one knows why the Allies hesitated so long before attacking them. Their destruction would certainly have been much more useful than the destruction of three hundred towns (p. 282).

"The Allies could have shortened the war by at least a year and a half if they had wanted to. . . . By the end of 1944 petrol shortage was so severe that tanks could no longer be used during the offensive in the Ardennes. Similarly, if centres of fuel production had been attacked at the right moment, the war could have been brought to an end much more swiftly."

(K. Bartz: *Quand le ciel était en feu*, pp. 363-365)

By the end of April 1945, Germany had been invaded on every side, all her principal towns had been destroyed, and she was cut off from her basic resources. In such a situation it was impossible to continue the struggle, and on 30th April Hitler committed suicide in his bunker at Berlin, and his successor, Grand Admiral Doenitz, signed the order for unconditional surrender demanded by the victors on 7th May, to take effect from midnight 9th May.

VI

THE NUREMBERG TRIAL

We have already made several references to the question of responsibility, and this leads us to consider the war crimes trials, of which Nuremberg was the most celebrated and the most spectacular.

One of the essential clauses imposed on the defeated nation was that the political and military leaders of the Hitler regime, who were regarded as war criminals, should be brought to judgement.

The Allies are very proud of this innovation, which in principle was intended to punish war crimes and which, it was claimed, would establish a reign of Right and Justice in the world in future, thus serving to prevent the outbreak of new conflicts. The theory sounded magnificent, but in practice, the Nuremberg Trial, which served as the basis for numerous other processes, was a sinister and macabre farce. Proof of this is so abundant and obvious that we will simply confine ourselves to a brief resumé.

Let us first of all establish its origin in history. It is Dr. Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Jewish Congress, who claims for himself and for his Congress the honour of having first expounded the idea of setting up a court of justice for the purpose of punishing Nazi war criminals. This is what he says :

“The World Jewish Congress established the Institute of Jewish Affairs, where the groundwork was laid for two main objectives : ensuring that the Nazi criminals did not escape punishment and obtaining maximum restitution from a defeated Germany. It was in this Institute that the idea of punishing Nazi war criminals was first conceived, an idea later taken up by some great American jurists, notably Justice Robert H. Jackson of the Supreme Court, and implemented in the Nuremberg Trials. The idea of prosecuting and sentencing political and military leaders for crimes against humanity was completely new in international justice. Many jurists, unable to see beyond the concepts of conventional jurisprudence, were dubious or categorically opposed to it; also, the principle that one cannot be punished for a crime not prohibited

by law at the time it is committed and that subordinates cannot be penalized for carrying out the orders of their superiors, seemed to argue against it. But these arguments were outweighed by the importance of exacting retribution for the Nazi regime's monstrous crimes against Jews and gentiles. The precedents had to be established that national sovereignty is no defence against infringements of the most basic principles of humanity, and obedience to a superior is not a valid excuse for individual and mass crimes. From this point of view the Nuremberg Trials were a momentous event in the history of international justice and morality. Not only did they prove their worth in bringing the top Nazi criminals to justice; they also served as an effective warning and deterrent for the future. Under the direction of Jacob and Nehemiah Robinson the World Jewish Congress put great effort into the intellectual and moral groundwork for these trials, and it is one of the triumphs of the Roosevelt administration that it consistently accepted these principles despite all the misgivings of some influential Allied circles, particularly in England."

(Dr. Nahum Goldmann: *Memories*, pp. 216-217)

The idea of these trials was launched by Nahum Goldmann in his opening speech at the Pan-American Conference of the World Jewish Congress, which was held at Baltimore in 1941. It was very carefully studied and perfected by the World Jewish Congress between 1942 and 1943, and then imposed on the American Government with the enthusiastic support of Roosevelt and his entourage.

The fate of the German leaders under the Hitler regime seems to have been discussed in public for the first time at the Teheran Conference in November 1943, and three years later, Elliott Roosevelt, the son of the American President, who was present at the banquet which was given by Stalin at the end of the Conference, published a very detailed account of the exchanges which took place during the conversation on that occasion, and from which we have taken the following passages:

"Toward the end of the meal Uncle Joe arose to propose his umpteenth toast . . . and it was on the subject of Nazi war criminals. I cannot hope to remember his words exactly, but it ran something like this:

"I propose a salute to the swiftest possible justice for all Germany's war criminals—justice before a firing squad. I drink to our unity in dispatching them as fast as we capture them, all of them, and there must be at least fifty thousand of them."

"Quick as a flash Churchill was on his feet. (By the way, the

PM stuck to his favourite brandy throughout the toasting; his nightly regimen of cognac prepared him well for Russian-style conversation, but that night I suspect that even such a redoubtable tippler as he was finding his tongue thicker than usual.) His face and neck were red.

"Any such attitude", he cried, "is wholly contrary to our British sense of justice! The British people will never stand for such mass murder. I take this opportunity to say that I feel most strongly that no one, Nazi or no, shall be summarily dealt with, before a firing squad, without proper legal trial, no matter what the known facts and proven evidence against him!"

"I glanced at Stalin: he seemed hugely tickled, but his face remained serious; only his eyes twinkled as he took up the PM's challenge and drew him on, suavely pricking his arguments, seemingly careless of the fact that Churchill's temper was now hopelessly lost. At length, Stalin turned to Father and asked his opinion. Father, who had been hiding a smile, nevertheless felt that the moment was beginning to be too highly charged with bad feeling: it was his notion to inject a witticism.

"As usual," he said, "it seems to be my function to mediate this dispute. Clearly there must be some sort of compromise between your position, Mr. Stalin, and that of my good friend the Prime Minister. Perhaps we could say that, instead of summarily executing fifty thousand war criminals, we should settle on a smaller number. Shall we say forty-nine thousand five hundred?"

"Americans and Russians laughed. The British, taking their cue from their Prime Minister's mounting fury, sat quiet and straight-faced. Stalin, on top of the situation, pursued Father's compromise figure; he asked around the table for agreement of new estimates. The British were careful: The subject requires and deserves a great deal of study, they said. The Americans, on the other hand, were more jocular: Let's brush it off—we're still miles and miles and months and months away from Germany and conquest of the Nazis. I was hoping that Stalin would be satisfied by the early answers, and change the subject before he got to me, but if he is anything, he is persistent. The question came. Somewhat uncertainly I got to my feet.

"Well," I said, and took a deep breath, trying to think fast through the champagne bubbles. "Isn't the whole thing pretty academic? Look: when our armies start rolling in from the west, and your armies are still coming on from the east, we'll be solving the whole thing, won't we? Russian, American, and British soldiers will settle the issue for most of those fifty thousand, in

battle, and I hope that not only those fifty thousand war criminals will be taken care of, but many hundreds of thousands more Nazis as well.' And I started to sit down again.

"But Stalin was beaming with pleasure. Around the table he came, flung an arm around my shoulders. An excellent answer! A toast to my health! I flushed with pleasure, and was about to drink, for it is the Russian custom for one to drink even when it is his own health that is proposed, when all of a sudden an angry finger was being waved right in my face.

"Are you interested in damaging relations between the Allies? Do you know what you are saying? How can you dare say such a thing?' It was Churchill—and he was furious, and no fooling. Somewhat shaken to find the Prime Minister and the Marshal squabbling right over my head and feeling a little like Alice-in-Wonderland being crowded by the Hatter and the March Hare at the celebrated Tea Party, I regained my chair, and sat quiet, worried stiff.

"Fortunately the dinner broke up soon afterward, and I followed Father back to his apartment to apologize. After all, damaging relations between the Allies!

"Father roared with laughter. 'Don't think a second about it,' he insisted. 'What you said was perfectly all right. It was fine. Winston just lost his head when everybody refused to take the subject seriously. Uncle Joe . . . the way he was needling him, he was going to take offence at what anybody said, specially if what was said pleased Uncle Joe. Don't worry, Elliott.'

"'Because you know . . . the last thing I'd . . .'

"'Forget it,' said Father, and laughed again. 'Why, Winston will have forgotten all about it when he wakes up.'

"But I don't think he ever did forget it. All the months I was to be stationed in England, later on, I was never again invited to spend the night at Chequers. Apparently Mr. Churchill never forgets."

(E. Roosevelt: *As He Saw It*, pp. 188-191)

"Thus began", as Mr. Veale observes in his remarkable book *Advance to Barbarism* (p. 216), "the first exchange of views on the then startling and seemingly original suggestion that, after a victory, there ought to be a grand massacre of the vanquished.

"There is, of course, no obligation to accept Elliott's story as an accurate, objective account of what took place that evening in Teheran, since it is obviously written to glorify President Roosevelt's statecraft, urbanity, and tact at the expense of Mr. Churchill,

whom Elliott evidently heartily disliked. Still, in its main outlines, no doubt, Elliott's story should be accepted as approximately accurate . . . and what he says took place at Teheran is entirely consistent with what we all know took place later.

(F. J. P. Veale, *ibid.*, pp. 217-218)

"Six years after the publication of Elliott Roosevelt's version, however, an alternative account of this episode has become available from the pen of Mr. Winston Churchill himself, in the instalment of his War Memoirs entitled *Closing the Ring* (1952). True, Mr. Churchill complains that Elliott's version is 'highly coloured and extremely misleading', but in fact his own version confirms Elliott's account of the essential point of the story. At this banquet at Teheran, Mr. Churchill says that Stalin pointed out that Germany's strength depended upon 50,000 officers and technicians and, if these were rounded up and shot, 'German military strength would be extirpated'. In spite of Mr. Churchill's indignant protest, however, these 50,000 must be shot, Stalin insisted.

"The two versions therefore agree that a massacre of 50,000 persons when victory was achieved was proposed by Stalin at the Teheran Conference but, whereas Elliott says these 50,000 were to be 'war criminals', Churchill says they were to be the officers and technicians upon whom Germany's strength depended. . . . What Stalin clearly had in mind was a massacre similar to the Katyn Forest Massacre which the Soviet authorities had carried out only three and a half years before. . . . As a Marxist it was natural that Stalin should frame his proposal in the way in which Mr. Churchill says he framed it. It was equally natural that Elliott Roosevelt, knowing nothing of Marxian ideology, should quite guilelessly have assumed that Stalin must have intended to propose the mass execution of criminals, and so, without intending to mislead, he interpreted Stalin's words in his own bourgeois phraseology. (*ibid.*, p. 219)

"It is fortunate that this incident has been recorded in such detail by two independent witnesses whose testimony is on the essential point so exactly in agreement. . . ." In the event, "the Soviet Government proved most accommodating: so long as liquidation was reached in the end, it was of no consequence what preliminary judicial fooleries were indulged in to satisfy capitalist susceptibilities. . . . Ultimately, the American solution was carried out; Stalin had his mass murder and Mr. Churchill his trial."

(F. J. P. Veale, *ibid.*, pp. 218, 220, 224)

The Nuremberg Trial served as a prototype for numerous other War Crimes Trials of which the most important, although it was hardly reported in the European press, was the great Tokyo Trial. The trial of the German war criminals opened at Nuremberg on 20th November 1945, under an American President, Justice R. H. Jackson of the Supreme Court of the United States. America bore the cost of the trials, it was Americans who guarded the prisoners, and the executioner was an American. In other words, it was America, with Jewish and Soviet support behind the scenes, who bore the responsibility for the trial.

In his opening speech, Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson, Chief Prosecutor for the United States, stated :

"We would make clear that we have no purpose to incriminate the whole German people. . . . If the German populace had willingly accepted the Nazi programme, no Storm-troopers would have been needed in the early days of the Party, and there would have been no need for concentration camps and the Gestapo."
(*The Trial of Major German War Criminals*, HMSO, 1946, p. 6)

"Any resort to war—to any kind of war—is a resort to means that are inherently criminal. War inevitably is a course of killings, assaults, deprivations of liberty and destruction of property (*ibid.*, p. 39). . . . The Charter recognizes that one who has committed criminal acts may not take refuge in superior orders nor in the doctrine that his crimes were acts of State. These twin principles, working together, have heretofore resulted in immunity for practically everyone concerned in the really great crimes against peace and mankind (*ibid.*, p. 42) . . . the ultimate step in avoiding periodic wars, which are inevitable in a system of international lawlessness, is to make statesmen responsible to law. And let me make clear that while this law is first applied against German aggressors, the law includes, and if it is to serve a useful purpose it must condemn, aggression by any other nations, including those which sit here now in judgment." (*ibid.*, p. 45).

These are fine sentiments, but they are nevertheless difficult to put into practice.

The act of indictment was divided into four main counts :

1. The crime of conspiracy,
2. Crimes against peace,
3. War crimes,
4. Crimes against humanity.

These accusations were thought up by the Americans, but up to the present time they are unrecognized in international law. Besides,

they were new and ill-defined notions that were not at all easy to proceed upon.

The Tribunal was composed of the following members: The United States were represented by Justice Jackson and ten assistants. The chief British prosecutor was the Attorney-General, Sir Hartley Shawcross, assisted by the Lord Chancellor, Jowitt, and eleven assistants. France was represented by Robert Falco, a barrister of the Court of Appeal, and Professor Andre Gros, a specialist in international law, and for the Soviet Union there was General T. Nikitchenko, vice-president of the Supreme Court of Moscow, and two assistants.

The deliberations which preceded the opening of the Nuremberg Trials were held in the greatest secrecy in London. At first, everything went wrong, so wrong, in fact, that on several occasions it seemed as if the discussions would end in failure. The result of these labours was the London Agreement, which was made public on 8th August 1945, but the details of the sessions, which were not published until four years later, revealed serious differences of opinion, and indeed it was evident that certain problems seemed insoluble:

1. What would be the attitude of the Tribunal if the German defence raised the question of wars of aggression and crimes committed by other nations?
2. How was one to justify the accusation and condemnation of certain men whose acts, given the state of the law at that time, could not be considered as crimes?
3. By creating new precedents, would not the victorious countries lay themselves open to similar charges in turn in the future?
4. Should the ticklish question of aerial attacks against defenceless towns and civilian populations be brought up?

And this was not all. At that time London was swarming with refugees from Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia and Poland. These exiles were vigorously opposed to permitting the Russians holding a seat on the future international court. In their opinion, Russia, who had dismembered Poland and commenced wars of aggression against Finland and the Baltic States, ought to be sitting with the accused and not among the judges.

The British delegation was also troubled by the possibility that the German defence would represent the occupation of Norway as a legitimate act of defence, which could be a source of embarrassment. But Jackson had already found a way of overcoming this reef. A clause would be inserted in the statutes of the Tribunal limiting the

extent of the trial simply to the consideration of acts committed by the accused. In other words, the criticism or even the discussion of the acts of the victorious governments was formally forbidden.

Another problem was that of responsibility, or more exactly, personal responsibility. Relatively easy to sort out when it was a matter of Goering or Frank, it became extremely delicate in the case of certain technicians such as Schacht, for example, the financial expert, who had no part in any crime or in any infraction of international law.

Most of these criticisms and objections were perfectly valid, as the future was to show, but the Americans had their way, and on the heels of the London Agreement, which was drawn up between the British, American, French and Russian Governments to establish a body to be called the International Military Tribunal for the trial of the "major war criminals whose offences have no particular geographical location", the Nuremberg Trial opened on 20th November 1945. On 30th September 1946, after 407 sessions, the verdict was pronounced. Twelve of the accused were sentenced to death: Goering, Ribbentrop, Keitel, Kaltenbrunner, Rosenberg, Frick, Frank, Streicher, Sauckel, Jodl, Seyss-Inquart and, in his absence, Martin Bormann.

Hess, Funk and Raeder were condemned to life imprisonment, and Schirach and Speer got twenty years, Neurath fifteen, and Doenitz ten. Schacht, von Papen and Fritzsche were acquitted. Those condemned to death were executed in the night of 15th to 16th October, but two hours before the execution was due to take place, Goering committed suicide in his cell with a cyanide pill. It was never discovered how he had managed to get hold of it.

The criticisms that can be raised against the Nuremberg Trials and the numerous other trials to which it gave birth are so numerous, so evident and so irrefutable that it will suffice if we just resume them here briefly.

1. At Nuremberg, it was not a question of a neutral and impartial tribunal; it was a court of the conquerors sitting in judgment on the leaders of a vanquished country, who had no right of appeal.

2. The notion of "war crimes" such as established at Nuremberg is an entirely new conception which until then had not existed in any known code of laws. War crimes, crimes against peace, crimes against humanity and crimes of conspiracy are decidedly vague terms, very difficult to define and susceptible of very varied interpretations.

3. When acts which may be regarded as "war crimes" had been committed simultaneously by the Germans and by the Allies, either they were **not** regarded as crimes, and were never brought up at

Nuremberg, as was the case with the aerial bombardments, for example, or else the Germans were condemned and the Allies were automatically absolved if not glorified since, according to Justice Jackson, it was forbidden to criticize or even to discuss the acts of the victorious governments. In other words, at Nuremberg the unforgivable crime was to be on the side of the vanquished.

4. Unconditional obedience to one's superior's orders was regarded as a crime at Nuremberg, when these orders were held to be contrary to morality or to national interest, but unconditional obedience was required on the Allied side, or at least was considered as a perfectly valid excuse in the case of misdemeanours committed on their side. Besides, military discipline is impossible and no army could exist if the lower ranks were allowed to debate their orders.

5. At Nuremberg and at the trials which followed thereafter, any number of sentences were passed based upon retroactive considerations, or in other words, they were condemned for acts which were in no way considered as crimes or offences at the time when they had committed them, and this is contrary to the most elementary principles of law and to the most ancient traditions of legal practice.

6. The presence of the Russians among the judges at Nuremberg was a bitter mockery and a permanent violation of all principles of justice, since Soviet Russia alone has been responsible for more crimes than any other European country, including Hitler's Germany.

7. Under the label of "war criminals" there were lumped together regardless in one group, an assortment of Hitler's thugs, misled idealists, servile courtesans, and heroic soldiers and sailors whose conduct had been irreproachable.

8. The whole world now knows, as Field-Marshal Montgomery has pointed out, that at the end of the next war, the political and military leaders of the vanquished countries will be executed in the manner determined by the customs of the victors. We have stepped back to the epoch of Attila and Genghis Khan, when the victors automatically massacred their enemy. That will not help to lessen bloody wars nor to reduce the severity of the strife.

One of the capital mistakes committed by the Allies at Nuremberg was to equate the Wehrmacht with the Nazi party and thus render the German Generals responsible for the extortions and wrongs of the regime. In fact there always existed a fundamental antagonism between the Wehrmacht leaders and the Nazi party. The German Generals, who had been schooled in the traditional discipline of the old imperial army, regarded Hitler as a low-class upstart, and reproached him for lowering political morality to the level of gangsterism and discrediting Germany in the eyes of the civilized nations.

Hitler, who felt that they secretly despised him, hated and distrusted his generals, especially when they belonged to the old German military aristocracy. But he could not dispense with them, and hence his anger, which at times gave vent to outbursts of uncontrolled fury.

This antagonism increased in proportion as the situation worsened on all fronts, and when it became evident that Hitler's presence at the head of the government was leading Germany to catastrophe, there was only one solution: to get rid of Hitler. Unfortunately, however, obedience and discipline are as second nature in the German army, and only a desperate situation would urge the generals to open rebellion. Besides, public opinion in Germany would have to be taken into account if it was to succeed; but the public, intoxicated by Goebbels' propaganda, completely misunderstood the situation and blindly trusted in its Fuhrer. On top of that, one has to take into account Roosevelt's pro-Soviet policy—the Morgenthau Plan, Germany's total and unconditional surrender, and the surrender of half of Europe to the Soviets—a crazy policy from the European point of view, which made the whole situation even more complicated, since the German generals were patriots, and they were not prepared to sacrifice Hitler merely in order to hand over Germany bound hand and foot into Soviet tyranny. It was a formidable situation to be resolved.

Several attempts to assassinate Hitler failed at the last moment owing to unforeseen circumstances. On 20th July 1944 Hitler had a miraculous escape, and following this attempt a great number of officers and politicians were massacred, including some of the most famous leaders of the German army: Colonel Count von Stauffenberg, a war hero of the Afrika Corps who was covered with wounds, and who had been the mainspring of the plot, and Marshals Rommel, von Witzleben, and von Kluge, Admiral Canaris, General von Stulpnagel, and others.

It cannot be denied that on Hitler's express orders the war in the East was conducted with an extreme savagery for which the German army was not responsible. The German generals had always protested against such barbarous methods of warfare, but Hitler took not the slightest note of them.

The English writer, John W. Wheeler-Bennett has clearly described the reaction of the German army's leaders to these barbarous orders in his book *The Drama of the Germany Army*:

"Quite a few of the generals who had campaigned in Poland were shattered by what they had seen. These men were normally

able to withstand the horrors of war, but they were not prepared for the abominations engendered by the Nazi ideology. When they had heard their Fuhrer speaking of 'extermination' at Obersalzberg on 22nd August, they imagined that he was being carried away by force of oratory and by his imagination. When he had said: 'our strength lies in the absence of all pity, and in violence' and when he had spoken of 'mercilessly killing everyone of the Polish race and tongue, men, women and children', they little imagined that they were supposed to take these proposals literally, forgetting that, except when he had given his word, Hitler always thought what he spoke.

"It wasn't long before they discovered the terrible truth. The Polish campaign had only been launched two weeks, and victory was already in sight, when Ribbentrop informed Keitel, on the Headquarters train on 12th September, of the Fuhrer's instructions for dealing with the Polish question. These instructions included massive executions among all the members of the intelligentsia, the nobility and the clergy—in other words, among all the classes capable of providing future leaders in the event of a resistance movement—and a general massacre of the Jews.

"Keitel transmitted these instructions to Canaris, who was absolutely confounded. The 'little Admiral' replied that such a thing was impossible, and that German military honour would be stained for all eternity if he were to allow such horrors to take place. But Keitel replied that the Fuhrer had ordered that these measures should be carried out, and furthermore, he had added that if they were not to the army's liking, the army would have to accept an equal number of SS and SIPO (security police) units, who would carry out the Fuhrer's orders independently of the military authorities. (This is in fact what happened one month later.) Under these conditions, the armed forces of the Reich had no choice but to obey the orders of their supreme commander. 'A day will come', Canaris told Keitel with prophetic accuracy, 'when the world will hold the Wehrmacht, under whose eyes these things have been allowed to happen, responsible for these atrocious measures'."

(op. cit., p. 389, translated from the French edition)

The same methods were applied even more strenuously against the Russians, and it is virtually certain that this policy cost Hitler the war, since, at the beginning, the German troops were frequently greeted as liberators from the bolshevic tyranny. But Hitler was not waging war against bolshevism but against the Russian nation and

against the Slav race, which was the greatest assistance to Stalin, whose regime, tottering on the edge of defeat, was thus consolidated. Hitler was massacring national élites in the name of the superior race, and Stalin was doing the same on his side in the name of a revolutionary morality which demanded the annihilation of social classes that could not be assimilated by Marxism. The war which this state of affairs produced attained apocalyptic depths of horror, but once again it was the Party and not the army which bore the responsibility.

Among the Nuremberg files is a document of capital importance. It is a secret report which was sent to Alfred Rosenberg by Dr. Brautigam on 24th October 1942. Rosenberg was the Nazi minister in charge of the administration of occupied territory in the East, and Dr. Bräutigam was political adviser to Marshals List and Kleist who were in command of the army on the Caucasian front.

In his report, Bräutigam sets out with great clarity and extraordinary frankness the main mistakes in Hitler's policy towards the Russian people. He does not hide the fact that such a savage attitude could cost Germany the war, and in fact this is precisely what happened. Here are the essential passages from this report:

"When we entered Soviet territory, we found a people exhausted by bolshevism, and desperately awaiting a new ideology which would bring them the hope of a better future. Germany's duty was to provide them with this ideology (*Sic: formules*), but this was not done. The people greeted us with joy as liberators, and willingly put themselves in our hands.

"But with the natural instinct of Eastern peoples, they soon discovered that for Germany the slogan 'liberation from bolshevism' was simply a pretext for reducing them to a new slavery. . . . Peasants and working-men soon understood that Germany did not regard them as partners possessing equal rights, but simply as the object of her own political and economic ideals. With unequalled presumption . . . we treated the people of occupied Eastern territories as 'second-class whites', whom Providence had assigned to Germany alone as her slaves. . . .

"It is no secret that our Russian prisoners died of hunger and cold by the hundreds of thousands. As a result, we are now in the absurd position of having to recruit millions of workmen in the occupied territories of the East, having allowed thousands of prisoners of war to die of hunger like flies. . . .

"With the fathomless scorn of the prevailing Slav mentality, methods of 'recruiting' were employed whose origins doubtless go

back to the darkest periods of the slave trade. A veritable man-hunting campaign was instigated. Without any consideration for their age or physical condition, people were sent into Germany.

"Our policy forced both the bolsheviks and the Russian nationalists to combine against us, and today Russia is fighting with a courage and an exceptional spirit of sacrifice simply in order that its human dignity should be recognized."

Naturally this report was completely ignored. Hitler, Rosenberg and Himmler, who were all in favour of adopting a tough line vis-à-vis the Slavs, would not hear of it. Goebbels was indeed aware of the errors being committed, but he was powerless against the other three.

The generals of the Wehrmacht reacted as best they could. But Hitler forbade them to interfere in politics, and they had all their time taken up in conducting the war without being concerned about other matters such as this.

The historian, J. de Launay, in his *La Guerre Psychologique*, clearly demonstrated the efforts the Wehrmacht made to counter-balance Hitler's policy :

"The first reception accorded by the 'liberated' Russian peoples to the Wehrmacht had been favourable, and all the heads in the army recommended a policy of collaboration. Lieutenant Colonel Gehlen even proposed that 200,000 Russian volunteers, who wanted to serve in the German army, should be armed. Gehlen, like Colonel Count Stauffenberg, thought that in order to conquer Russia, it was necessary to co-operate with the Russians while liberating them from the Soviet system. But Keitel informed them on several occasions that 'the Fuhrer did not want politics in the armed forces'.

"The Russian prisoners of war were maltreated, and they turned to resistance. Nevertheless, Stauffenberg and Bräutigam endeavoured to find a 'Russian de Gaulle'. Marshal von Bock approved a plan for creating a 'liberation army' of 200,000 Russian volunteers, but Bock was dismissed in the autumn of 1941 and his successor, Marshal von Kluge, did not dare to raise the question with the Fuhrer.

"In September 1941 the municipal council of Smolensk, which had recently been set up by the Germans, had demanded permission to form a free Russian government, but Keitel's reply, which was received in November, had been a categorical refusal.

"Thereafter there was a succession of individual initiatives :

General von Schenkendorff decided to form six Russian battalions under the command of the Cossack Kononow, in order to protect the railway lines to the rear of the armies in the central group. General Schmidt, commander of the second tank army, set up a self-governing Russian district (Lokotj) under the leadership of a former Russian mayor, Kaminski. Later, Kaminski, who had been made a brigade commander, formed his own army.

"The Reichskommissariat, on the other hand, pursued their punitive action, openly firing upon the people, and provoking resistance movements.

"The propaganda service of the Wehrmacht, under the direction of General von Wedel, attempted to redress the balance, and even considered adopting a scheme of agrarian reform. A Russian emigré, Kasanzew, was put in charge of drawing up leaflets and publishing a propaganda newspaper, but there again Keitel blocked all these efforts.

"In August 1942, at the time the German armies were conquering the Caucasus, a new hope arose, when General Köstring, the former military attaché at Moscow, was appointed adviser to Marshal List. Bräutigam was his political adviser, and he recommended to List and his successor, Kleist, a certain degree of co-operation with the Russians. Rosenberg had promised Bräutigam that labour forces would not be conscripted for work in Germany from the Caucasians, and that the rapid dissolution of the kolkhozes was envisaged. Accordingly, Köstring and Bräutigam were well received in the Caucasus, and even witnessed extraordinarily joyful 'liberation celebrations'. But after the defeat at Stalingrad, the Caucasian collaborators were compelled to flee, and they sought permission to join with the German army in its retreat. This was granted to Bräutigam by Marshal Kleist, but many who believed in the Germans' word were nevertheless abandoned.

"The whole of this operation is revealing of the flagrant contradiction which existed between certain of the Fuhrer's directives. On the one hand there was Rosenberg, carrying out a punitive policy by means of his unscrupulous gauleiters, and on the other hand, Goebbels, the political idealist, was promising a better future. These deceiving claims, which were shown up every day by the facts of the occupation, certainly contributed to reuniting the Russian people against the invader.

"Psychologically, Germany's action in the East was a total failure. The Fuhrer alone bears the blame for this."

(*Les Dossiers de la Seconde Guerre Mondiale*, 5th part, "The Psychological War", by J. de Launay, 1964)

However, the Wehrmacht succeeded in reconstituting the Wlassof army, which had a considerable strength, but Hitler, who was extremely suspicious of this initiative, fanatically opposed its entry into the war, and as a result, it remained virtually inactive up to the end.

The Americans handed over the leaders of the Wlassof army to the Russians, who hanged them and sent their soldiers into labour and concentration camps.

While still on this subject, let us quote Admiral Doenitz's reaction, as Commander in Chief of the Navy, and Hitler's successor-designate, when he discovered the existence of Hitler's concentration camps:

"On 7th May, Friedeburg and Jodl returned to Mürwick. Friedeburg brought with him a copy of *Stars and Stripes*, an American military publication, which contained some appalling photographs taken in the concentration camp at Buchenwald. Doubtless, the disorganization of transport and the supply of food had not served to improve the conditions in these camps in the course of the last weeks; nevertheless, it was beyond question that nothing could justify the conditions that these photographs demonstrated. Friedeburg and myself were staggered. We would never have imagined that such things were possible! But they were indeed true—and not only at Buchenwald—as we realized for ourselves when a boat transporting detainees of a concentration camp arrived at Flensburg. The eldest naval officer did everything in his power to feed and care for these unfortunate people. How could such horrors have happened in Germany without being brought to our knowledge?

"Up to 1939, I had spent my whole time at sea, as Commander of the *Emden*, and then in charge of the submarines. As from the outbreak of war, I lived mainly at my command Headquarters, which were first at Sengwarden, in Eastern Frisia, and then at Paris and Lorient. These various places were a sort of military oasis. We had little or no contact with the German people. Technical problems and the conduct of submarine warfare absorbed all my time. The only information that came through to me from the enemy concerned submarines. As far as I was concerned there was no doubt that the enemy radio was and ought to be controlled for propaganda purposes, as ours was. Accordingly, I didn't listen to either.

"When I was put in command of the Navy, I usually stayed at my command post, 'Koralle', which was a lonely place between

Bernau and Eberswalde, to the north of Berlin. When I visited General Headquarters, I only took part in military conferences, and Hitler only consulted me on questions within my competence. Besides, as I have said, it was impossible to take any interest in anything else, since all my time was taken up in my work.

"The facts which I learnt about the inhuman side of the National Socialist regime in the months which followed the capitulation in 1946 exerted a profound influence over me. I have set out above my attitude towards the Party and my relations with Hitler. As I have said, the idea of a national community, in the proper, social sense of this word, and the cohesion of the German people upon this base, fired me with enthusiasm. Hitler's reunion of all the branches of the German race under one Reich seemed to me the achievement of one of the oldest dreams of our nation. Our dispersion can be traced back to the Treaty of Westphalia, which brought to an end the Thirty Years War. Our adversaries, who had achieved their own unity at the beginning of the modern era, wanted to keep us weak and to prevent us achieving our unity for a very long time. Only National Socialism had been able to overcome all these obstacles, and accordingly it has acquired immense historical value.

"But it was then that I learnt about its other aspects, which were infinitely less attractive, and as a result my attitude suddenly changed towards the regime which he (Hitler) had created.

"On 6th May, I relieved Himmler of all his functions. When I discovered all the facts relative to the concentration camps, I was sorry that I had let him off, since I was of the opinion that it was a purely German affair, and that we ourselves ought to bring to light all these atrocities, and ourselves punish those who were guilty. Count Schwerin-Krosigk was of exactly the same opinion. He sent me a decree ordering legal proceedings to be set up to enquire into these heinous crimes, and I sent a copy of the text of it to Eisenhower, requesting him to allow our judges every necessary facility for taking these steps. At an interview with General Murphy, the General's political adviser, I specifically brought this point to his attention and requested his support, which he promised me, but I never heard any more about the matter".
(Grand Admiral Doenitz: *Ten Years and Twenty Days*, translated from the French edition)

The Allies, who had barely understood what was happening in Germany during the war, thus committed a tragic error in equating the army with Hitler's regime. The condemnation at Nuremberg and

other places, of impeccable leaders such as Doenitz, Raeder, von Kesselring and von Manstein, or of Yamashita at Tokyo, was a perfectly iniquitous and monumental act of injustice. Goering, Keitel and Jodl, on the other hand, could justly be considered as servile politicians, who were the accomplices of and co-responsible for the acts of the Party.

The Allies, however, did something infinitely worse than that. Their erroneous equation of the army with the Party in Germany, the policy of terror-bombing, the blindly pro-Soviet attitude of the Americans and their obstinacy in demanding global and unconditional surrender from Germany—all these factors combined to produce consequences of quite exceptional gravity. For as a result, the war was utterly needlessly prolonged for a further year and a half, hundreds of thousands more men were killed, and worst of all, the Soviets were enabled to occupy half Europe, in which they have become solidly entrenched, representing a far greater menace for the West than ever did Nazism.

Today the Americans are paying for the politically criminal and insane policy adopted by Roosevelt at Quebec, Teheran and Yalta, unless it can be said that he and his Jewish advisers actually intended to hand over Europe to Communism, a conclusion which would seem to be justified by the famous Morgenthau Documents.

In his Memoirs, Admiral Doenitz has clearly explained the tragic dilemma with which he found himself confronted when he was suddenly made responsible for Germany's future as Hitler's successor-designate.

"In January 1945 the German government entered into possession of the British instruction 'Eclipse' which dealt with 'Measures to be adopted for the occupation of Germany' after its unconditional surrender. A map, attached to the document, showed the division of the country between the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain. It corresponded to the future delineation of the zones of occupation, with the exception of the French zone, which was introduced at the Yalta Conference. This division, and the methods revealed in the Morgenthau Plan, caused us to fear for our future existence as a separate nation.

"The severity of these intentions strengthened our political opposition to the alternative of bringing a rapid end to hostilities by means of an unconditional surrender. Besides, there were other extremely important and practical considerations against adopting this course.

"On 12th January 1945, the Russians launched a new offensive.

They penetrated into Silesia and reached the middle bank of the Oder at Kustrin and Frankfurt. The Wehrmacht was unable to fulfil its natural mission of protecting our peoples in the East and their territory. Terrified masses fled towards the West. They knew what the Soviet invasion meant. In October 1944, having captured Goldap and several villages on the frontier of Eastern Prussia, they massacred their inhabitants with unheard of cruelty. An appeal to the Red Army by the Jewish writer, Ilya Ehrenburg, made it quite clear :

“ ‘Kill’. Kill ! In the German race there is nothing but evil; not one among the living, not one among the yet unborn but is evil ! Follow the precepts of Comrade Stalin. Stamp out the Fascist beast once and for all in its lair ! Use force and break the racial pride of the Germanic women. Take them as your lawful booty. Kill ! as you storm onwards, kill, you gallant soldiers of the Red Army !’ ”

“In my opinion”, continues Doenitz, “the first duty which befell what remained of our armed forces was to save these unfortunate peoples. If, to our great sorrow, we were unable to defend their lands, the very least we could do was to save their lives. If only for this reason, it was indispensable to pursue the struggle on the Eastern front.

“There is another factor to consider. At the behest of the Allies, the war could only be terminated by our unconditional surrender. As far as our troops were concerned, the signature of this capitulation would immediately arrest their movements. They would have to lay down their arms and hand themselves over, wherever they might be. If we had capitulated in the winter of 1944-1945, three and a half million soldiers, who were still very far from the Anglo-American front, would have been taken prisoner by the Russians. With the best will in the world the latter would have been incapable of looking after them, feeding and sheltering them. Our men would have had to camp out in the open and in the cold, and in consequence there would certainly have been an appalling mortality. What happened in May, at a much more favourable time, is proof of this. Even in the West, the English and the Americans were unable to provide enough food for their prisoners, large numbers of whom died.

“In consequence, the termination of the war by unconditional surrender during the winter of 1944-1945 would have entailed the death of millions of soldiers and civilians. None of those who then held a responsible position in the Wehrmacht could urge this course of action. None of the unfortunate refugees in the East

would have agreed to being handed over to the Russians in this way, and no soldier wanted to endure Soviet captivity. The troops probably would not have obeyed the order to stop where they were and hand themselves in. No commander could have signed the capitulation at this period without knowing that it would not be respected and also that by so doing he would be consigning a large number of people to their destruction. . . . No one in conscience could take such a decision.

"Painful though it was to have to continue the struggle and sacrifice men on land and on sea, and accept the civilian losses caused by the bombing raids, nevertheless it had to be done because these sacrifices would in the end prove to be less than those which a premature surrender of the territories of the East would have entailed."

In the first days of May, Admiral Doenitz began direct negotiations with Field-Marshal Montgomery, with a view to concluding a partial German capitulation, limited to the English sector on the Western front, and independently of the Russian front. Montgomery laid down certain conditions before it could be accepted.

"On 4th May I gave Friedeburg full powers to accept Montgomery's demands. He left by aeroplane for the British Headquarters, with instructions to continue, after the convention had been signed, to Reims, where General Eisenhower was stationed, in order to offer a similar partial capitulation to the Americans. After his departure, we felt a burden had been taken off our shoulders. We had just taken the first step towards surrender in the West without having to agree to surrender our soldiers and civilians to the Russians. This had other consequences. Montgomery demanded the cessation of hostilities on the sea, and the surrender of ships which were in the waters of Holland, North-West Germany, Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark. Going one step further ahead, at midday on 4th May I ordered our submarines throughout the world to cease hostilities. This was part of my intention to cease hostilities against the West at the earliest possible moment.

"In the evening Friedeburg announced that he had signed the capitulation with Montgomery and that he was leaving to see Eisenhower. The capitulation took effect from eight o'clock on the morning of 5th May.

"On the morning of 6th May, General Kinzel, who had accompanied Friedeburg, arrived at Mürwick, having been sent by Friedeburg to inform me of the state of negotiations with Eisen-

hower. The latter, he told me, in contrast with Montgomery, refused to accept a partial capitulation under any conditions. We had to surrender now unconditionally, and on every front, including the Russian front. The troops were to lay down their arms, wherever they might be, to be taken prisoner. The High Command of the Wehrmacht would be responsible for seeing that this surrender was carried out, and the order extended to all ships of war and commerce.

"We were afraid that Eisenhower might adopt this attitude. In my speech on the wireless on 1st May, I had said: 'As from this moment, the British and the Americans are no longer fighting for their own countries, but for the extension of bolshevism in Europe'. An American station, situated at Eisenhower's General Headquarters, had replied that this was 'a typical and well-known trick of the Nazis in an endeavour to create a split between Eisenhower and his Russian allies'.

"However the latest operations which he had ordered showed that he was not in the least aware of the turn taken by world politics at that moment. After his troops had crossed the Rhine at Remagen, America had achieved her strategic object of conquering Germany. From this moment the paramount objective should have become political, namely, the occupation of the largest possible area of Germany before the arrival of the Russians. Thus it would have been judicious for the American commander to have pushed rapidly East in order to be the first to seize Berlin. But Eisenhower did not do this. He kept to the military plan which had been drawn up for the destruction of Germany and its occupation in collaboration with the Red Army, and so he stopped at the Elbe. Thus the Russians were enabled to take Berlin and conquer whatever they could of eastern Germany. Perhaps this policy had been dictated by Washington, but he did not understand how radically the world situation was to be transformed from this moment. Accordingly, I consider that this decision by the Americans was wrong, and I have not changed my opinion today.

"After the Potsdam Conference, an American Colonel told Count Schwerin-Krosigk that it was a matter of indifference to him whether the whole of Germany was occupied by the Russians, and this indeed was the attitude of all American opinion.

"If I had accepted the conditions brought back by General Kinzel on that morning of 6th May, I would have had to hand over our armies in the East to the Russians immediately. I could

not accept this, the troops would not have obeyed the order. A mad rout towards the West would have resulted. Thus Eisenhower's conditions were unacceptable, and all I could do was to try and convince him that I could not possibly allow our soldiers and civilians to fall into the hands of the Soviets, and accordingly I had to be content with offering this partial capitulation.

"I summoned Jodl to send him to Friedeburg's help with new instructions. I wrote out a note to Jodl, giving him full power to sign a general capitulation on all fronts, but he was only to use it if he was unable to obtain the first objective, which was a partial capitulation, and then only after he had informed me of the conditions and received my express agreement by cable. On 6th May he flew to Reims.

"On the night of 6th to 7th May I received the following message from him: 'General Eisenhower insists that we must sign now today. Otherwise the Allied lines will be closed against even individual persons who seek to hand themselves over, and all negotiations will be broken off. As I see it, either there is chaos or we sign. Confirm immediately by wireless that I have in fact got full powers to sign the capitulation. Then it can have effect. Hostilities will end on 9th May at 0 hours, German summer time. Jodl.'

"Eisenhower, we learnt, had again refused any partial capitulation and categorically rejected the two proposals. He told Jodl that he would fire on any German soldier, even unarmed, who approached the American lines in order to surrender himself. However, owing, it would seem, to the more understanding attitude of General Bedell Smith, his Chief of Staff, and to Jodl's statement that in the present condition of our communications, we would need at least two days to get the capitulation order transmitted to all the troops, he finally agreed to a delay of 48 hours, on condition that we signed on the spot. Thus I had to take an immediate decision. According to the telegram, if we signed on the 7th, the troops would still be able to move until 0 hours on the 9th.

"I was afraid that this delay would not suffice to save either all the soldiers or all the civilians. On the other hand, Jodl had succeeded in obtaining it, and it would nevertheless allow a considerable number of people to regain the security of the West. I would not have gained any advantage by refusing Eisenhower's demand, which would only have produced the chaos which we feared, and the immense and useless loss of human life.

"Consequently, at one o'clock in the morning, I telegraphed to Jodl that he was qualified to sign the general capitulation on this basis, which he did, at Reims, at 2.41 a.m.

"On May 8th, obviously at the wish of the Russians, this formality was repeated at the Headquarters of Marshal Joukov, the Soviet Commander in Chief, at Berlin-Karlshorst. Marshal Keitel, General Stumpff and Admiral Friedeburg signed for the three armed forces. The Western Allies and the Soviets had asked for full powers, which I had expanded, enabling them to carry out this gesture, and these powers were very carefully verified before the ceremony.

"The fate of the soldiers in the East and of the refugees was decided that day. The vast majority of the men in the Southern armies under General Rendulic succeeded in crossing the American demarcation lines. Those under General Lohr in the South Eastern group had less luck. On 9th May a good number of them were still several days march away. Lohr endeavoured by negotiations with the Yugoslavs to lessen the severity of their lot in every possible way, but several tens of thousands nevertheless died in the Yugoslav camps.

"In the North, the American General Carvin, who had occupied part of Mecklenburg on 2nd May with his airborne division, and who was working in with the British advance on Lubeck, since his division was part of the British army, allowed the remains of the 'Vistula Army' to cross behind his lines, but owing to delays numbers of columns of refugees fell into the hands of the Russians, who were following close behind.

"On the centre front, the twelfth army, commanded by General Wenck, had been ordered to free Berlin by attacking towards the East. Wenck succeeded in reaching the region of Potsdam, and thereby opened the road West to the defenders of this town and to the 9th army (General Busse), who brought with them a mass of refugees. But the civilians were not allowed to cross the Elbe. Wenck's army did everything in its power to smuggle over the largest possible number of refugees with them, unknown to the Americans, but this inhuman order condemned a large number of these unfortunates—some of whom had been fleeing for weeks—to the mercy of the Soviets.

"The soldiers of Schoerner's army met an even more deplorable fate. The vast majority of them reached the American lines, but they were not allowed to cross them. They were even fired upon in order to keep them back. After they had so valiantly accomplished their duty, those who did not die of hunger or cold

had to endure the rigours of Russian captivity for many long years."

(Grand Admiral Doenitz: *Ten Years and Twenty Days*, translated from the French)

"Obviously", Eisenhower was to write in his *Memoirs*, "the Germans sought to gain time in order to bring back into and behind our lines the maximum number of men who were still fighting in the East. I began to have had enough. I ordered Bedell Smith to tell Jodl that if he did not immediately stop dragging out the negotiations, we would go so far as to use force in order to prevent the refugees from crossing."

(translated from the French)

This in fact is just what the Americans did.

Thus by his obstinate intransigence, Eisenhower handed over hundreds of thousands, and perhaps even millions, of innocent Germans to the appalling bolshevic tyranny -- which, for the majority, meant either death or the concentration camps and, for the women, the prospect of certain violation. Was he ignorant or unaware of the lot that awaited them? Did he deliberately condemn these unhappy people to this terrible fate in order to carry out the dire Yalta Agreement? That is a question which I cannot answer, but this inhuman order will leave an indelible blot on Eisenhower's memory.

Between 5th May, the date of the armistice concluded with the British, and 9th May, the date of the general capitulation, Admiral Doenitz, by means of all the resources at his disposal, succeeded in rescuing three million German soldiers and civilians, who thus escaped Russian slavery owing to the understanding of Field-Marshal Montgomery.

Postscript

On 12th January 1971, *Le Monde* published (p. 5) a news report concerning the war in Indochina from which we have taken the following extracts:

"The trial of Lieutenant William Calley, the leading defendant accused of the Song-My massacre on 16th March 1968, when several hundred Vietnamese villagers were killed by American troops, reopened yesterday before the court martial at Fort Benning, Georgia. In his memoirs, which he has just published, Lieutenant Calley has implicated the whole American army in Vietnam. For his part, the former public prosecutor of the United States at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials, Mr. Telford Taylor,

considers that the former Commander in Chief of the American forces, General Westmoreland, was just as responsible during the Second World War as his Japanese counterpart was held to be.

"If the criteria which were applied against General Yamashita (who was found guilty of atrocities committed by his troops in the Philippines during the Second World War), were likewise applied to army personnel such as General Westmoreland', Mr. Taylor declared, 'he could find himself in the same situation. A general should control the conduct of his troops, and he should be held responsible for it.'

"Today Professor of Law at the University of Columbia, Mr. Taylor is not generally known as a radical. But he considers that the trial by court martial of a lieutenant, a captain and a sergeant for the massacre of the villagers of Song-My is a waste of time, since 'it is not at this level that the really guilty parties will be found'. Besides, he added, 'much more serious' than Song-My was the question of the deaths of all the civilians caused by the bombing raids, and the fact that the peasants were being forced to evacuate their villages. He claims that a Presidential Commission should be set up to investigate war crimes.

"For his part, Lieutenant Calley has stated, both in a declaration to Associated Press and in the memoirs which he has just published, that his trial completely ignored the realities of the war and of what actually happened at Song-My. 'We went to Vietnam to save those people, but we didn't even give them the crumbs off our own table. We hadn't even got the courtesy to learn their language or their customs. We despised them and we killed them.'

"The trial of another member of the company opened before a court martial at Fort MacPherson. A twenty-two-year-old sergeant was accused of having killed half a dozen Vietnam civilians. The young sergeant had admitted, in a statement to the enquiry board on 17th November 1969, that he had taken part in the massacre, and this statement was read out in front of the court martial.

"The soldiers entered the village on 16th March, and it was a massacre, said Sergeant Hutto. We shot into the houses and at people whether stationary or running. I did not agree with these murders, but those were our orders.

"—Can you explain why all the villagers were killed? the prosecutor asked.

"—They were all regarded as Communists, according to Captain Medina.

"—Even the babies and the little children?

"—Yes.

"Towards the end of the cross-examination, Sergeant Hutto's lawyer, Mr. E. Magill, a civilian, asked for an acquittal on the grounds of insufficient evidence. Mr. Magill declared that the responsibility for the massacre lay with Captain Medina, the company commander, and with the other officers who commanded the troops. 'Their duty was to kill', and the soldiers who did so had never been told 'what an illegal order was, or when it is lawful to obey and when it is lawful to disobey', and the lawyer emphasized that his client was not very well educated.

"The Army is holding an enquiry into Captain Medina's activities, but he has not been officially charged, although he has often come under suspicion."

It is obvious that nothing will come of Mr. Taylor's demand for a war crimes commission, but it is equally certain that such a step should be taken if the Nuremberg Trials are to have any moral value at all and be known as something other than the instrument of the victors' vengeance over their defeated enemies.

General Yamashita, who won renown for his lightning victory over the British army at Singapore, was charged at Tokyo as a war criminal, and with the responsibility for the excesses committed by isolated Japanese units who were lost in the depths of the Philippines, and with whom he had had no means of contact. He was condemned to death and hanged. The Japanese, it is true, often behaved with appalling cruelty in the last war, but to pick out General Yamashita as a criminal was a particularly unfortunate choice, since he was a great and honourable soldier, and the suspicion could be laid against the victors that they were avenging their defeat at Singapore.

Furthermore, the legal processes established at Nuremberg served as the basis for a great number of purge trials which were held in France after General de Gaulle came to power, and they created an atmosphere of terror and revolution. As at Nuremberg, obedience to a superior's orders was not considered as an excuse but a crime. The case of General Dentz is a typical example. He was condemned to death for obedience to the orders of a superior, and died in prison from maltreatment.

In these circumstances, I am astonished that no lawyer has used the precedents created at Nuremberg and Paris in 1945, to defend the French officers of the Algerian army, who claimed that obedience to orders from Paris was incompatible with their sense of military honour and their conscience as soldiers.

V

THE MYSTERIOUS TEHERAN AND YALTA AGREEMENTS AND THE SECRET ZABROUSKY DOCUMENT

In 1949 the Spanish Ambassador to Chile, Señor J. M. Doussinague, published a book entitled *España Tenia Razon* (Spain Was Right; all the quotations up to p. 86 in this chapter are taken from this book), in which he reveals Spain's attitude towards Soviet communism, the Axis powers and the Allies during the course of the Second World War. At that time he was the principal private secretary of Count Jordana, who was then Spain's Foreign Minister. Thus he was directly involved in the events which he describes in his book at first hand, and he reveals to us a secret document of the utmost importance concerning the Yalta Agreements :

"On 16th April 1943 a sumptuous ceremony was held at Barcelona in the Palace of the Kings of Aragon in honour of the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Christopher Columbus' return from his first voyage, when he had been presented to Ferdinand and Isabella and announced the discovery of the New World.

"It was attended by many eminent Spanish and South American personalities. After a solemn Te Deum had been sung in the cathedral of Barcelona, various speeches were delivered in the Royal Palace, including one by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Jordana. Minutely prepared and thought out, his remarks were addressed to the whole world, and should have had considerable repercussions. He announced that Spain was taking a new step forward in pursuance of plan D, which had been drawn up in order to facilitate peace negotiations.

"After asserting Spain's total independence from any foreign influence, he recalled that Spanish policy, in the present as in the past, was based upon Christian principles and traditions, and that in consequence his country could not be identified with those whose regimes were opposed to this ideology, which clearly meant

that Spain and her government could not be identified with a political system such as national-socialism."

Set apart from the world conflict, Spain's high mission, at the opportune moment, was to facilitate the re-establishment of a just and fraternal peace, but also to draw the attention of all peoples to the profound spiritual subversion and economic upheavals which would result from the war.

"More terrible and more destructive than the war", said Count Jordana, "more charged with hatred and wicked passions is the Communist revolution which represented all the greater danger since the enormous cost of the war would compromise the social stability of the nations."

Some hours after Count Jordana's speech, Mr. Cordell Hull, American Secretary of State, proclaimed: "The whole world knows that the sole objective of the United Nations is nothing less than the unconditional surrender of Germany."

At that moment Mr. Cordell Hull had only read several telegraphic references to Count Jordana's speech, and not the complete text, and he told the press that he knew nothing about Spain's proposition to negotiate world peace at the earliest possible opportunity.

For their part, Berlin and Rome ignored the proposition, and re-affirmed their determination unhesitatingly to pursue the common struggle until the peril which threatened Europe in both East and West had been overcome.

However, Count Jordana's speech was all the more important since the Spanish government had just been made aware of the existence of a document which was so important that it threatened the security of a great number of European countries. The document in question was a secret letter which had been written by President Roosevelt on 20th February 1943 to the Jew Zabrowsky, who was at that time acting as a liaison officer between himself and Stalin.

Here is the full text of this letter :

The White House, Washington,
20th February 1943

Dear Mr. Zabrowsky,

As I have already had the pleasure of telling you, together with Mr. Weiss, I am deeply moved to hear that the National Council of Young Israel has been so extremely kind as to propose me as mediator with our common friend Stalin in these difficult moments,

when any menace of friction among the United Nations—in spite of the many self-denying declarations which have been obtained—would have fatal consequences for all, but principally for the USSR itself.

It is therefore in your interest and ours to round off the corners—which becomes difficult to bring about with Litvinoff, to whom I have had, very regretfully, to point out that 'those who sought a quarrel with Uncle Sam would get something to complain about', with regard to internal as well as external affairs. For, having regard to Communist activities in the States of the American Union, his claims are absolutely intolerable.

Timoshenko proved more reasonable in his brief but fruitful visit, and indicated that a new interview with Marshal Stalin might constitute a rapid means of arriving at a direct exchange of views. I reckon that this is more and more urgent, particularly when one remembers all the good which has resulted from Churchill's talk with Stalin.

The United States and Great Britain are ready, without any reservations, to give the USSR absolute parity and voting rights in the future reorganization of the post-war world. She will therefore take part (as the English Prime Minister let him know when sending him the first draft from Aden) in the directing group in the heart of the Councils of Europe and of Asia; she has a right to this, not only through her vast intercontinental situation, but above all because of her magnificent struggle against Nazism which will win the praise of History and Civilization.

It is our intention—I speak on behalf of our great country and of the mighty British Empire—that these continental councils be constituted by the whole of the independent States in each case, with equitable proportional representation.

And you can, my dear Mr. Zabrowsky, assure Stalin that the USSR will find herself on a footing of complete equality, having an equal voice with the United States and England in the direction of the said Councils (of Europe and Asia). Equally with England and the United States, she will be a member of the High Tribunal which will be created to resolve differences between the nations, and she will take part similarly and identically in the selection, preparation, armament and command of the international forces which, under the orders of the Continental Council, will keep watch within each State to see that peace is maintained in the spirit worthy of the League of Nations. Thus these inter-State entities and their associated armies will be able to impose their decisions and to make themselves obeyed.

This being the case, a position so elevated in the Tetrarchy of the Universe ought to give Stalin enough satisfaction not to renew claims which are capable of creating insoluble problems for us. In this way, the American continent will remain outside all Soviet influence and within the exclusive concern of the United States, as we have promised the countries of our continent it shall.

In Europe, France will gravitate into the British orbit. We have reserved for France a secretariat with a consultative voice but without voting rights, as a reward for her present resistance and as a penalty for her former weakness.

Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece will develop under the protection of England towards a modern civilization which will lift them out of their historical decline.

We will grant the USSR an access to the Mediterranean; we will accede to her wishes concerning Finland and the Baltic, and we shall require Poland to show a judicious attitude of comprehension and compromise; Stalin will still have a wide field for expansion in the little, unenlightened countries of Eastern Europe—always taking into account the rights which are due to the fidelity of Yugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia—he will completely recover the territories which have temporarily been snatched from Great Russia.

Most important of all: after the partition of the Third Reich and the incorporation of its fragments with other territories to form new nationalities which will have no link with the past, the German threat will conclusively disappear in so far as being any danger to the USSR, to Europe and the entire world.

Turkey—but it will serve no useful purpose to discuss that question further, it needs full understanding, and Churchill has given the necessary assurances to President Inonu, in the name of us both. The access to the Mediterranean contrived for Stalin ought to content him.

Asia—we are in agreement with his demands, except for any complications which may arise later. As for Africa—again what need for discussion? We must give something back to France and even compensate her for her losses in Asia. It will also be necessary to give Egypt something, as has already been promised to the Wafdist government. As regards Spain and Portugal, they will have to be recompensed for the renunciations necessary to achieve better universal balance. The United States will also share in the distribution by right of conquest and they will be obliged to claim some points which are vital for their zone of influence; that

is only fair. Brazil, too, must be given the small colonial expansion which has been offered to her.

In view of the rapid annihilation of the Reich, convince Stalin—my dear Mr. Zabrowsky—that he ought to give way, for the good of all, in the matter of the colonies in Africa, and to abandon all propaganda and intervention in the industrial centres of America. Assure him also of my complete understanding and of my entire sympathy and desire to facilitate these solutions, which makes more timely than ever the personal discussion which I propose—the above is only a general outline of a plan which is intended for further study.

This is the issue and the whole issue.

As I told you at the time, I was very pleased at the gracious terms of the letter informing me of your decision and of the desire you expressed to offer me in the name of the National Council a copy of the greatest treasure of Israel, the scroll of the Torah. This letter will convey the confirmation of my acceptance; to those who are so frank with me, I respond with the greatest confidence. Be so good, I beg of you, to transmit my gratitude to the distinguished body over which you preside, recalling the happy occasion of the banquet on its 31st anniversary.

I wish you every success in your work as interpreter.

Very sincerely yours,
(signed) Franklin Roosevelt.

This version of the letter has been translated from the French, which in turn was taken from the original Spanish as published on pages 198–199 of Señor Doussinague's book, *España Tenia Razon*, and the author commented upon it as follows :

“So, by the benevolent resolve of Mr. Roosevelt, who was then preparing for the Teheran Conference in full agreement with Stalin, Central Europe, with the exception of Turkey and Greece—though the latter was to be deprived of Thrace in order to give the USSR free access to the Mediterranean—the Baltic countries, and certain countries of Western Europe such as Holland, Belgium and Switzerland, were to come under Soviet domination; Germany was to be dismembered; while the Asiatic continent, including the French colonies, would also enter the Soviet sphere. In Africa certain promises were made to Stalin. As the counterpart to this, in Western Europe, Italy, France, Spain and Portugal were to pass under the protection of England. America would remain entirely outside the influence and propaganda of the Soviets.

“But what is more, the USSR would take a hand in the choice

and preparation of international forces which were to be active within all European States, including those of the West; and the Asian States, constituted as the Council of Asia, and the European States, constituted as the Council of Europe, were to be directed by a group comprising the United States, the USSR, England and China, on a footing of complete equality, in complete disregard to the right to independence possessed by each of the countries so disposed of, and also of all that was representative of Christian civilization in the Continent of Europe.

"Spain, together with all the other European countries, would be subject to this directory body of which her worst enemy would be a member—the same enemy which had led the fight against us throughout the Civil War, and which could never forgive Spain for the defeat that had been inflicted on it under the guidance of Franco.

"A mere glance at this letter is enough to explain the amazement, the agitation and the fear we felt when we became aware of it. Our ardent desire to see peace come with all speed, before President Roosevelt's plans could be realized, can easily be imagined. Knowledge of this letter was the key to all the actions and gestures of Spain and served as a basis for the political discussions of its rulers. Thanks to this letter *we knew* (Doussinague's italics) what to expect of the post-war period . . . an immense catastrophe threatened to descend on Europe and on all its old civilization."

One month later, on 9th May 1943, General Franco made an important speech at Almeira from which we have extracted the principal passages:

"After he had renewed Spain's appeal for peace, since he considered it was madness to continue a war behind which there loomed up the spectre of something infinitely worse, General Franco explained how communism, the sower of hatred and barbarism, represented the image of the anti-Europe, the negation of our civilization and the destruction of everything which we hold most dear and valuable.

"In making this speech, General Franco had in mind Roosevelt's letter to Zabrowsky, and he hoped that a solution would be found to end the conflict before the incredible concessions which the letter promised to Russia were carried out.

"One of the principal obstacles which would confront the Spanish plan for peace was the existence of a real incompatibility between national socialist ideals and those of the rest of the

civilized world. If the Spanish proposition was to have a chance of succeeding, it would be necessary to diminish the gap between these principles, which were not only political, but even more of a religious nature.

"Two days after this speech, the United States Ambassador, Mr. Carlton Hayes, sent a secret letter to the State Department in Washington, whose contents became known to the Spanish government, in which he requested that the Barcelona and Almeira statements should not be interpreted in the United States as being inspired by the Axis. Spain, he wrote, seeks above all to preserve an independent policy which is not subject to any foreign power, she wishes to avoid any compromise, and she has decided to fight any aggressor from whatever side an attack might be mounted against her, either by the Axis or the Allies. Nevertheless it is true that she is in favour of victory going to the Allies.

The Spanish plan D for peace was met with scepticism on both sides of the struggle. A furious press campaign was let loose against Spain, especially after the Barcelona and Almeira statements, in England but above all in America, where the war was not popular and the government had been compelled to conduct an active propaganda campaign to convince the people of the necessity of the war.

"Roosevelt, who had a wrong impression of Spain, had drawn up a plan for the invasion of Spain at the same time that American troops were disembarking in Africa, and he also set off a slanderous press and radio campaign in order to prepare public opinion for this eventuality. However the conciliatory attitude of the Spanish government and the assurance that no measure would be taken prejudicial to the Allies and their future military operations in the Mediterranean were recognized by the United States Ambassador in Madrid, who wrote to the State Department on 22nd June 1943 to this effect.

"Towards the end of 1942 and in the early part of 1943 the Allies brought increasing pressure to bear on Spain to improve her relations with the Soviet Republic. At that time Russia had begun to take the initiative in the attack, and began a series of victories which were to lead her from the Volga to Berlin. She was held in considerable prestige by the Allies, who were then of the opinion that communism was less dangerous to the economic life of a country than Nazism.

"But for Spain, on the contrary, Russia was still the real, common enemy of England and the United States, as well as of Germany and Italy. This opinion was strongly contested by

America, who invited Spain to collaborate with Russia unless she wished to lose her economic aid from the United States.

"Spanish ambassadors had an exchange of views on this subject with the governments of Germany and Italy, as well as with the Vatican.

"On 18th March 1943 His Holiness Pope Pius XII received our ambassador, M. Barcenas, in audience. He congratulated him on the agreement which existed between the Spanish government and the Vatican, and approved our attitude with regard to the menace of national-socialism. On the latter subject he had some very hard words to say, and he was under no illusion that in time there would come a lessening of the anti-religious policy of the Reich.

"It was during this period of tension that on 21st October 1943 Mr. Hayes, the United States Ambassador at Madrid, sent Count Jordana a letter in which he spoke in the name of his government. He blamed Spain for confusing communism with Russia, and requested him to cease making official attacks against the latter country which was an important member of the United Nations and an ally of the United States. The American Ambassador accused the Spanish government of complacency towards Nazi Germany and of being thus the only free country to favour the latter. 'Communism,' he wrote, 'was essentially an interior problem of Russia's and in no way affected any country whose standard of living was sufficiently high to render its development impossible.' According to Hayes, Spain's systematic attacks against Soviet Russia would make it difficult for the Allies to continue their economic aid to Spain, for not only had they no intention whatever of opposing communism at the end of the war, but they were going to permit Russia to collaborate closely with the United Nations in future international peace conferences.

"Briefly, the United States were displeased with Spain's attitude to Russia and felt that it constituted a powerful obstacle preventing the amelioration of their mutual relations. Finally, the American Ambassador left Count Jordana with a note resuming the tenor of his communication. When he had departed, Count Jordana read the note with care and wrote at the head of the first page: 'This note is of the utmost gravity since it is not written in his own name but in the name of his government.'

"A few days later Count Jordana replied to the American Ambassador. Distinguishing between the American point of view, which was influenced by the psychology of the war and by the

powerful aid which Russia contributed towards a common victory, Count Jordana showed that the real problem lay on a spiritual level which far surpassed the actual development of events. The war was in fact a passing phenomenon and only secondary to the heart of the problem, which lay in communism.

"Spain, from its privileged situation as a neutral country, was in a position to study the grave problems of the day with greater serenity and objectivity, and because her policy was founded on Christian principles she considered that the most fundamental problem of the age lay in the bolshevik revolutionary movement of the masses who had been robbed of their faith, and which tended to seize countries by means of disorder and violence."

Here are the principal passages from Count Jordana's letter:

"As General Franco has on many an occasion stated, and in particular in his speech on 1st October, Spain considers that independently of the outcome of the war, and behind it, the world is faced with a spiritual problem of the utmost importance created by the revolutionary conditions of masses who have been separated from all belief in God, and whose aim is to improve their economic situation by recourse to violence and the utterly unscrupulous use of any means whatever. This revolutionary spirit, which is comprised of varying hues, is known by the generic name of bolshevism. The war is only a passing phenomenon as long as this spirit, which is much deeper and more lasting than the war itself, exists.

"I am sure Your Excellency will understand my astonishment and apprehension at learning that it is your conviction that the revolutionary peril can be overcome simply by raising the standard of living of the needy classes, as if there were not millions of communist party members in the most economically advanced countries. I can hardly believe that someone could imagine that this gigantic peril which threatens our civilization can be resolved by the mere adjustment of salaries. No, Your Excellency, it is not only an economic question, nor even a social problem in the widest sense of the word . . . we are confronted with a spiritual problem, an evil of the utmost gravity which reaches down to the deepest levels in the human soul, for when you teach the masses that morality is only a bourgeois prejudice and that there is no superior justice to which we are responsible for our acts, you remove the brake and urge them to attack any obstacle which opposes the satisfaction of their most brutal instincts. . . .

"One cannot state that bolshevism is simply an internal prob-

lem of the Russians. The Spanish government is in possession of documents and proofs which demonstrate that the Spanish communist movement was organized by agents who came from Moscow; and nobody can be ignorant of the fact that the revolutionary spirit which bubbles up from underground throughout the whole world is internally upheld and supported by the government of the Soviet Union. Its slogan, 'Proletarians of the world, unite' is the flag of rebellion against our present society and an appeal to its destruction.

"The Soviet Union advocates the dictatorship of the proletariat, a regime which is to be imposed by force. While Spain has no quarrel with the Russian nation as such, she is extremely uneasy at contemplating the self-proclaimed mission of the Soviet Union to foment revolution throughout the entire world . . . and at the hands of which she has suffered so much in recent years herself, with the blood of thousands of deaths and enormous destruction of property caused by communist activity in her own country.

"When one considers the real image of the Soviet Union, and its doctrine and sombre designs, it was not without apprehension that Spain witnessed the military victories of the Soviets, behind which there reared up the spectacle of a terrifying future, notably for those European countries occupied by the Soviet armies. This is why Spain could not share the optimism of the United States Ambassador, neither as far as concerned the so-called religious liberty said to exist in the Soviet Union at the present time, and which in the final analysis would appear to be a purely political expedient, nor as far as concerns a supposed evolution of the Soviet regime.

"Spain can state with a full realization of the truth of the assertion that any democratic regime which in any way resembled the Soviet system would be abused by Russian agents who benefiting from the liberty conferred on them by the former, would use it to work for their own ends and for the eventual substitution of their own regime. This is precisely what happened at Madrid during the Civil War when Largo Caballero, 'the Spanish Lenin' and the head of the red government, was overthrown by a republican-democratic faction which sprang from the communist bloc. Although the republicans themselves had tolerated communist atrocities without protest, they were nevertheless driven out in their turn by the Russian agents and their henchmen who stirred up a veritable revolution with violent strife in March 1939."

Señor Doussinague continues :

"The Spanish Foreign Minister had received the very clear impression that the exchange which had been begun by Ambassador Hayes had expressed the point of view of the State Department, and his reply of 29th October, which set out with great sincerity and solid argumentation the doctrinal basis of Spanish thinking and policy towards the war, was the most important statement of its kind yet to have been published.

"Ambassador Hayes' reply to the Spanish Foreign Minister, dated 27th December 1943, took some little notice of the arguments presented by Count Jordana, but nevertheless considered that Russia was a victim of German aggression."

We have extracted the principal points of this reply below :

"The Ambassador agreed that communist Marxism was a real danger for the free world, but at the same time he thought that Spain, under the influence of the recent civil war, had an exaggerated fear of Russia and an immoderate confidence in Nazi Germany,

"He could not believe that Russian communism, despite the regime of terror with which it had been inaugurated and its subversive influence in Spain before and during the civil war, constituted a greater danger than German nazism, which he held represented a much greater threat to the liberty of the nations and to traditional, Christian civilization. It was Germany which had attacked Russia and Europe, in order to devastate them. The American Ambassador forgot that in 1939, by agreement with Germany, Soviet Russia had invaded Poland, Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, all of whose inhabitants had been deported, and had brutally attacked Finland.

"After the war, he thought, the Russian menace to Europe and the world would in no way compare to the threat posed by the alliance between Nazi Germany and pagan Japan. Besides, for a long time Russia would be dependent on her allies for aid to enable her to repair her own ravages and for that reason alone would be obliged to observe the Atlantic Charter. The rebirth of religious feeling and patriotism was a guarantee of her goodwill and desire for international collaboration. Therefore Spain could no longer continue in the role of peacemaker if she still persisted in an intransigent attitude to Russia.

"On 11th January 1944 Count Jordana replied to Hayes and told him that the struggle in which Spain was engaged against communism was far superior in concept to that being waged by

the Axis. It was always necessary to distinguish between the errors of Hitler's regime, which were repugnant to the catholic conscience of the Spanish nation, and Germany's geographical situation in the front line of the defence of Europe against the appalling storm arising in the steppes of Asia. A call for the rectification of the equivocal doctrines of nazism was no reason for destroying the defensive strength of Germany considered as a front line of resistance against the deadly invasion from Asia, and for that reason it was essential to save Germany from the risk of annihilation. To put it briefly, if nazism was a decidedly abominable idea, for a diplomat Germany represented a European reality which had to be taken into consideration.

"The American Ambassador and his collaborators nevertheless continued to work for an improvement in the relations between Spain and the United States, after the correspondence terminated, but they had little illusion that they would succeed in changing the opinion of Count Jordana and the Spanish government.

"In December the Teheran conference took place, and two men, Stalin and Roosevelt, whom Churchill attempted in vain to oppose, disposed of the fate of the whole world without being subject to any control whatever, and freely shuffled the cards determining the future of non-communist countries and the lot of their inhabitants.

"We know now," Señor Doussinague wrote, "that for military reasons Eisenhower and the American government opposed Churchill's plan envisaging a landing in the Balkans. If Churchill's plan had been accepted, the history of these latter years would not have been quite so filled with tears and horror.

"In general, the strictly military outlook concentrates its efforts on solving the problems immediately to hand. Thus it sacrifices the future, or, which comes back to the same thing, it prepares new problems which are sometimes even more grave than they would have been had they not been foreseen and stifled before taking shape. The real statesman is the man who can stand up in a high observation post and command a long view. If you abandon criteria of policy during the struggle, you close your eyes to the morrow."

It now remains to bring this chapter of Spanish history to its conclusion.

Roosevelt's secret letter to Zabrowsky, published in Señor Doussinague's book, is an extremely important document, and it seems quite extraordinary that such a document, reproduced in a book of

an official character which had been written by a diplomat who was formerly Count Jordana's secretary, and placed publicly on sale in Madrid—it seems extraordinary, I maintain, that this document should have remained practically unknown outside Spain. As far as I am aware, it has only been mentioned in a French newspaper some years ago, but the journalist who wrote the article about it does not seem to have understood its importance, and its publication produced practically no reaction at all. The United States Embassy, when consulted about the document, was manifestly extremely embarrassed, and delayed a long time before finally sending a brief note in reply saying that the State Department had found no trace of the letter in its archives.

Quite apart from the inherent prudence of all diplomatic service, this reply really carries no significance since it is a question of a personal and secret exchange of correspondence between President Roosevelt and Mr. Zabrowsky, his intermediary with Stalin.

The Spanish Government has not divulged its source, nor, in its place, would any other government have done so. All we know is that it was a feminine personality in the immediate circle around Roosevelt who secretly communicated the document to the Spanish Government.

The Spanish Government was absolutely certain of its authenticity since their policy and the speeches of their rulers have been profoundly influenced by it; furthermore, it is an undeniable fact that the agreements reached at Teheran and Yalta were in conformity with the lines indicated in this famous letter.

I have personally questioned the author of the book, Señor Doussinague, who granted me an interview when he was Ambassador at Rome. Naturally he did not reveal any diplomatic secrets, but he made the following very judicious remarks:

"The authenticity of the document is apparent merely from its context. Carry yourself back to the time with which it deals; who was there among us—unless it were some prophet, who would have been accused of being out of his mind—who could have imagined in advance that Roosevelt, acting in his personal capacity, was about to hand over half of Europe and Asia to the Soviets, secretly and without gaining anything in return?"

Finally, a certain number of conclusions may be drawn from this document.

1. There have been attempts to excuse Roosevelt on the score that at Yalta he was a dying man unable to defend himself in the conduct of the negotiations. The letter to Zabrowsky, on the con-

trary, proves that the Yalta Agreement had been prepared far in advance by a secret understanding between Roosevelt and Stalin.

2. It was Jews who served as intermediaries between Roosevelt and Stalin, confirming the enormous influence which Jewish advisers of his immediate circle exerted over Roosevelt, and their Communist tendencies.

3. Jewish circles therefore bear a heavy responsibility for the disastrous Treaty of Yalta and for the seizures made by the Soviets in Europe and Asia.

4. This does not relieve Roosevelt in any way of his personal responsibility. His lack of awareness of what he was doing and his failure to comprehend Stalin's communism remain utterly amazing. There are only two possible explanations for his attitude: either he was truly ignorant, to an astonishing degree for a politician who was so astute, or he was a conscious agent of subversion, entirely dominated by the Jewish influences around him.

In either event, his presence at the head of the American Government, and the latter's omnipotence, at a crucial moment in history, represented a very grave danger which threatened the future of the whole world and in particular of western civilization. America, however, was the first to suffer the effects of this disastrous policy, which was so blind to reality, and today Count Jordana's predictions have indeed come true.

For many years now, America has been engaged in a cold war with Russian and Chinese communism, and maintains a gigantic strength of naval, military and air defences which are kept in a state of permanent alert in readiness for the outbreak of war.

She has replaced Germany in an "unholy alliance with pagan Japan"; she waged a costly war against Chinese communism in Korea, and in South East Asia is still conducting a bloody struggle against the Viet Cong, who are supported by Russian and Chinese communism, and which she is far from winning; not to mention, Cuba, South America, Africa and other hot spots throughout the globe.

As time goes on and the light of history becomes clearer, we can reaffirm with greater certitude: yes, Spain was right.

* * *

The tragic events in Czecho-Slovakia have focused attention anew on the Yalta Agreement. The United States have been accused of doing nothing to oppose the invasion of Czecho-Slovakia by Russian tanks, because this country came under the zone of influence attributed to the Russians in Europe by the Yalta Agreement.

In reply to this charge, the United States special envoy in Paris, Mr. Averell Harriman, who was leading negotiations with Vietnam, recently stated with great firmness that no division of the world into zones of influence took place at Yalta.

The Zabrowsky document, which we have published, shows that at least in Roosevelt's mind such a division took place. But the Zabrowsky letter is a secret document whose authenticity can only be proved by the Spanish Government, although it is true that Count Jordana, who was then Spanish Foreign Minister, had no doubt whatever as to its validity.

However, when my *Freemasonry and the Vatican*, in which an English version of the Zabrowsky letter was published for the first time (pp. 182-184), was launched in London in the spring of 1968, I held a press conference at which I was approached by an American member of the audience, who told me that the document is unquestionably authentic, since confirmation of it may be found in the *Memoirs of Cardinal Spellman*. Researching this clue, I found that there is in fact a long passage in these memoirs which constitutes an implicit and very striking confirmation of this famous document.

On 2nd September 1943, the Cardinal, who was then Archbishop Spellman, dined at the White House with President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, and on the following morning he had a long conversation, lasting an hour and a half, entirely alone with the President, and which he wrote down at once in his memoirs. In it the Cardinal resumes Roosevelt's thoughts as he had expounded them in the course of the interview, and here they are as related by Rev. R. I. Gannon, SJ, in *The Cardinal Spellman Story*:

"It is planned to make an agreement among the Big Four. Accordingly the world will be divided into spheres of influence: China gets the Far East; the US the Pacific; Britain and Russia, Europe and Africa. But as Britain has predominantly colonial interests it might be assumed that Russia will predominate in Europe. Although Chiang Kai-shek will be called in on the great decisions concerning Europe, it is understood that he will have no influence on them. The same thing might become true—although to a lesser degree—for the US. He hoped, 'although it might be wishful thinking,' that the Russian intervention in Europe would not be too harsh.

"*League of Nations*:

"The last one was no success, because the small states were allowed to intervene. The future League will consist only of the four big powers (US, Britain, Russia, China). The small states will

have a consultative assembly, without right to decide or to vote. For example, at the armistice with Italy, the Greeks, Jugoslavs and French asked to be co-signers. 'We simply turned them down.' They have no right to sit in where the big ones are. Only the Russians were admitted, because they are big, strong and simply impose themselves.

"Russia:

"An interview with Stalin will be forced as soon as possible. He believes that he will be better fitted to come to an understanding with Stalin than Churchill. Churchill is too idealistic, he is a realist. So is Stalin. Therefore an understanding between them on a realistic basis is probable. The wish is, although it seems improbable, to get from Stalin a pledge not to extend Russian territory beyond a certain line. He would certainly receive: Finland, the Baltic States, the Eastern half of Poland, Bessarabia. There is no point to oppose these desires of Stalin, because he has the power to get them anyhow. So better give them gracefully.

"Furthermore the population of Eastern Poland wants to become Russian. Still it is absolutely not sure whether Stalin will be satisfied with these boundaries. On the remark that Russia has appointed governments of communistic character for Germany, Austria and other countries which can make a communist regime there, so that the Russians might not even need to come, he agreed that this is to be expected. Asked further, whether the Allies would not do something from their side which might offset this move in giving encouragement to the better elements, just as Russia encourages the Communists, he declared that no such move was contemplated. It is therefore probable that Communist Regimes would expand, but what can we do about it. France might eventually escape, if it has a government *à la* Leon Blum. The Front Populaire would be so advanced, that eventually the Communists might accept it. On the direct question whether Austria, Hungary and Croatia would fall under some sort of Russian protectorate, the answer was clearly yes. But he added, we should not overlook the magnificent economic achievements of Russia. Their finances are sound. It is natural that the European countries will have to undergo tremendous changes in order to adapt to Russia, but he hopes that in ten or twenty years the European influences would bring the Russians to become less barbarian.

"Be it as it may, he added, the US and Britain cannot fight the Russians. The Russian production is so big that the American

help, except for trucks, is negligible. He hopes that out of a forced friendship may soon come a real and lasting friendship. The European people will simply have to endure the Russian domination, in the hope that in ten or twenty years they will be able to live well with the Russians. Finally he hopes, the Russians will get 40% of the Capitalist regime, the capitalists will retain only 60% of their system, and so an understanding will be possible. This is the opinion of Litvinoff.

"Austria:

"No plan for the Austrian Government in Exile is made or tolerated. There will be no opposition to a Russian dominated Communist Austrian Regime. The one thing that would save Austria from the Communists would be if Otto of Austria succeeded to gain that throne with the help of Hungary. But even then he would have to deal with the Russians.

"Germany:

"Agreement has been reached between R[oosevelt] and Churchill, that Germany will be divided into several states. It will have no more central government, but will be under the domination of the Big Four, mostly Russia. There will be no peace treaty, but simply a decree of the Big Four. Before that hearings would be held, but these would have no influence. Germany would be divided into the following states: Bavaria, Rhineland. Saxony, Hesse, Prussia. Württemberg would become part of Bavaria, Saxony would take parts of Prussia. Hanover would become an independent state; Germany would be disarmed for forty years. No air force, no civilian aviation, no German would be authorized to learn flying.

"Poland:

"Poland, if re-established, would get Eastern Prussia.

"Other Countries:

"Plebiscites would be held in the following countries: France, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Norway, Greece. No plebiscite is to be expected in Czecho-Slovakia.

"How far this type of 'realism' reflected the thinking of Roosevelt's 'favourite Bishop' can be gathered from the deep concern voiced at this time by the American hierarchy on the increasing influence of Soviet Russia in the distribution of the spoils of war. Its members agreed that secularism, exploitation, and totalitarianism, whether Fascist, Nazi, or Communist, could never lead to a

lasting peace, while Archbishop Spellman himself was urging everywhere that we keep the spirit of revenge out of our activities and 'win the war without destroying our victory'.

"While the Archbishop was still a guest in the White House, word came that Montgomery had slipped two divisions across the Straits of Messina and the Allied invasion of the Continent was at last an accomplished fact. The joy of the news with its implication of approaching victory was tempered for many by the increased danger of the Holy Father's situation."

(R. I. Gannon : *The Cardinal Spellman Story*, pp. 222-225)

"By this time, however, the writer's sincere devotion to the President was already troubled by doubts. The more he thought about the policy of unconditional surrender and discussed it with military authorities of the highest rank, the more impossible it was for him to accept it. He could see that it not only stiffened German resistance and cost both sides innumerable casualties, but it made everything the Pope and he himself had been praying for seem so futile. The Holy Father's favourite phrase, repeated again and again, had been 'Peace with Justice,' but what armed forces had ever been just with an utterly prostrate foe? . . . to complicate matters, the second Conference at Quebec had been held in September. There the plan of Secretary Morgenthau to annihilate the German people by dismembering their country and giving pieces of flesh to all the neighbours; by wrecking all the mines and factories and condemning seventy million human beings to live off a piece of land that would not feed half of them; a plan characterized by Secretary Hull as one of 'blind vengeance,' had been accepted by Churchill and Roosevelt almost without reservation.

"On the same day that Hull had received the President's memo embracing the Morgenthau plan, he received another informing him that Morgenthau had presented at Quebec, in conjunction with the plan for Germany, a proposal of credits to Britain in the amount of six and a half billion dollars. The Secretary of State wrote later : 'This might suggest to some the *quid pro quo* with which the Secretary of the Treasury was able to get Mr. Churchill's adherence to his cataclysmic plan for Germany. . . . This whole development at Quebec, I believe, angered me as much as anything that had happened during my career as Secretary of State.'

"On Roosevelt's return to Washington, Hull found that 'he did not seem to realize the devastating nature of the memorandum of

15th September to which he had put his "O.K.—F.D.R." ' Later in the month, Secretary Stimson had a talk with the President from which he drew the same conclusion :

"He informed me [said Hull] that he had thereupon read to the President several sentences from the President's memorandum of 15th September, concluding with the phrase 'looking forward to converting Germany into a country primarily agricultural and pastoral in its character.'

"Stimson informed me that the President was frankly staggered at hearing these sentences and said that he had no idea how he could have initialled the memorandum, and that he had evidently done so without much thought.

"This ominous change that was coming over the President was not lost on the observant Archbishop. It brought back to his mind snatches of conversation that had disturbed him during the past year in many of their friendly visits together. He could recall the disarming smile with which Roosevelt would say, 'The Pope is too worried about communism,' and the rich tones of his voice as he expressed his sympathy with the great Soviet democracy. 'Russia,' he said one evening when they were sitting around after dinner in the White House, 'has need of protection. She has been invaded twice, you know. That is why we shall give her part of Poland and recompense Poland with a part of Germany.'

"The Archbishop protested, 'But your decision cannot cause a part of Poland to become Russia except by driving the population off their land. It is immoral to uproot people like that and take away their homes and their churches and even their cemeteries.'

"He remembered especially the interview the week before the President left for his conference with Stalin and Churchill at Teheran. It had shocked him profoundly that Roosevelt would go much more than halfway to meet the Red dictator in his own back yard, and he told him so. Nor was he reconciled when his 'old friend' answered with a smile, 'Don't worry. I know how to talk to Stalin. He is just another practical man who wants peace and prosperity.'

"The Archbishop answered, 'He is not just another anything. He is different. You can't trust him. He'll never co-operate.'

"Worried as he often was, however, he would conclude that despite occasional signs of irresponsibility, coupled with loose social and political planning, F.D.R. was still a genius, a very charming genius, and able to end the horrors of a world war."

(R. I. Gannon, *ibid.*, pp. 245-246)

"After a few months, however, as details of the things that were done at Yalta gradually seeped through to the American people, the Archbishop's old doubts and fears began to grow into genuine disillusionment. The climax came when His Excellency learned that his one-time ideal had handed over to Soviet Russia, not only Southern Sukhalin but all the Kurile Islands too, for it stirred the memory of a certain evening at the White House just after his return from Alaska. It was a painfully vivid memory. Roosevelt had been summing up for his guests the events in the Pacific Theatre and pointing to a map on the wall that showed the Kurile Islands, said dramatically: 'those islands are a dagger aimed at the heart of America. They must never fall into the hands of an enemy'. The Archbishop realized, with a sinking feeling, that the dagger was now in the hands of our most dangerous enemy and that a sick President had unwittingly put it there."

(R. I. Gannon, *ibid.*, p. 248)

VI

THE MORGENTHAU, KAUFMAN AND BAR-ZOHAR DOCUMENTS

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary has recently published a series of documents which present very detailed information on the extraordinary activities of the Secretary of the Treasury during the crucial years 1934-1945, Henry Morgenthau, Jr. These documents are of the utmost interest, for they unveil the whole of the secret history of the foreign policy of the American Government during this period.

Entitled *Morgenthau Diary*, and published by the US Government Printing Office in Washington in November 1967, the documents are published in a work which consists of two enormous volumes of a total of some 1,650 pages dealing exclusively with American policy with regard to the war, Germany, and Europe, and they were prepared by the Subcommittee to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary.

As the foreword of the publication itself states, "Dr. Anthony Kubek, Professor of History at Dallas University, and head of its History Department, acted as a consultant to the Subcommittee in the selection of the documents and has written an introduction to place events recounted in the diary items in their proper historical perspective. The Kubek analysis is regarded as both brilliantly presented and historically sound, and the Subcommittee is proud to offer these additional portions of the Morgenthau Diaries together with Dr. Kubek's introduction, for the information of the Senate." This analysis is some 81 pages long, and in the following pages I shall give a résumé of Dr. Kubek's findings, quoting extracts from the most important passages.

"The Morgenthau Diaries," Dr. Kubek informs us, "run to 864 numbered volumes, with additional unnumbered volumes, bringing the total to 900. Each contains about 300 pages. In all, there are approximately one million words of transcripts of con-

versations among high-ranking Treasury officials . . . the documents in the present volume deal primarily with the Treasury Department's policy towards Germany during World War II and in the immediate postwar period. This data not only serves a historical purpose regarding events prior to and during the Second World War, but also indicates the serious problem of a Cabinet department exceeding its jurisdiction by presuming to make foreign policy as a result of unauthorized, uncontrolled and often dangerous power exercised by nonelected officials."

(Morgenthau Diary, p. 1)

A footnote at this point states that "Morgenthau himself recognized the potential usefulness of the Diaries. A week after his resignation in July 1945 he discussed with his aides the question of what to do with the Diaries. Assistant Secretary Dan Bell warned that there was material in the Diaries 'embarrassing' to many individuals because 'we have talked quite frankly in your conferences about a lot of people'. Morgenthau's secretary, Mrs. H. Klotz, agreed. The Treasury Attorney, J. Pehle, was worried that the Republicans, if they 'got in' and began 'investigating the Roosevelt regime' might subpoena the Diaries. He advised, therefore, that the Diaries 'be carefully edited and the personal and flippant material deleted'. This, he told Morgenthau, 'would be in your own interest and in the public interest' " (ibid.).

These documents, therefore, published by the Government of the United States, bear an absolutely indisputable stamp of official authenticity, and they reveal the enormous influence which his Jewish advisers—Bernard Baruch, H. Morgenthau Jr., Harry Dexter White and others—exercised on President Roosevelt. At a crucial epoch in the history of the world a group of Jews in political circles succeeded in secretly orientating the foreign policy of the United States, and they played a major role in the development of events in Europe. It is not stating it too strongly to say that it was a question of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, surrounded by exclusively Jewish collaborators and advisers, pursuing a policy which was dictated purely by Jewish concerns and without for one moment caring about American interests.

Profiting from the friendship which existed between himself and President Roosevelt, Morgenthau completely exceeded his position, and although he was really only Secretary of the Treasury, he nevertheless took control of American foreign policy during the years 1934-1945, ignoring the Ministers of War and State Department who were normally the properly qualified men to handle these

affairs, but who were powerless to oppose him and who sometimes were quite simply ignorant of decisions which had been taken in secret by Morgenthau and Roosevelt.

A most notable example of this instance was the famous Quebec Conference, where decisions vital to the future of Europe were taken by Roosevelt and Churchill. The only others present were Morgenthau and Harry Dexter White, for Stimson and Hull, the Ministers of War and of the State Department were carefully excluded. How many people remember that the abolition of diplomatic secrecy had been formulated by Wilson in 1918 when President of the USA, as one of the essential bases of democracy?

"Before Morgenthau was appointed Secretary of the Treasury, he had lived near Roosevelt's home at Hyde Park, N.Y., for two decades, and could be counted as one of his closest and most trusted friends."

(*Morgenthau Diary*, p. 2)

It is this friendship which explains his nomination to the Treasury and the enormous influence which he exerted throughout the whole war upon American foreign policy.

"The conduct of American foreign policy today consumes such a large share of the annual budget that the Secretary of the Treasury and his financial experts automatically become involved in diplomatic decisions of all kinds. In Roosevelt's time, however, Secretary Morgenthau's deep involvement in questions of international significance sorely annoyed other Cabinet members and created considerable friction with the State Department. . . . In his *Memoirs* (vol. 1, pp. 207-208) Secretary of State Cordell Hull described it in these terms: 'Emotionally upset by Hitler's rise and his persecution of the Jews, Morgenthau often sought to induce the President to anticipate the State Department or to act contrary to our better judgement. We sometimes found him conducting negotiations with foreign governments which were the function of the State Department. His work in drawing up a catastrophic plan for the post-war treatment of Germany, and inducing the President to accept it without consultation with the State Department, was an outstanding example of this interference.'

"Elsewhere in his *Memoirs* (vol. 1, p. 207) Hull acknowledges that Morgenthau was an able administrator with an 'excellent organisation . . . headed by Harry Dexter White'. Actually it was Dr. Harry Dexter White, Morgenthau's principal adviser

on monetary matters and finally Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who conducted much of the important business of the Department. The Diaries reveal that White's influence was enormous throughout the years of World War II" (ibid., p. 2).

"Shortly after Morgenthau became Secretary in 1934, White joined his staff as an economic analyst on the recommendation of the noted economist, Prof. Jacob Viner of the University of Chicago. . . . In 1938 the position of Director of Monetary Research was created for him, and in the summer of 1941 he was given the additional title and duties of 'Assistant to the Secretary'. Articulate, moustachioed, and nattily dressed, he was a conspicuous figure in the Treasury but remained unknown to the public until 1943, when newspaper articles identified him as the actual architect of Secretary Morgenthau's monetary proposals for the post-war period.

"The Diaries reveal White's technique of domination over general Treasury affairs by submitting his plans and ideas to the Secretary, who frequently carried them directly to the President. It is very significant that Morgenthau had access to the President more readily than any other Cabinet member. He ranked beneath the Secretary of State in the Cabinet, but Hull complained that he often acted as though 'clothed with authority . . . to shape the course of foreign policy.'

(Hull: *Memoirs*, vol. 1, p. 207)

"Over the years White brought into the Treasury, and into other branches of Government, a number of economic specialists with whom he worked very closely. White and his colleagues were in a position, therefore, to exercise on American foreign policy influence which the Diaries reveal to have been profound and unprecedented. They used their power in various ways to design and promote the so-called Morgenthau Plan for the post-war treatment of Germany. Their power was not limited to the authority officially delegated to them; rather it was inherent in their access to, and influence upon, Secretary Morgenthau and other officials, and in the opportunities they had to present or withhold information on which the policies of their superiors might be based. What makes this a unique chapter in American history is that Dr. White and several of his colleagues, the actual architects of vital national policies during those crucial years, were subsequently identified in Congressional hearings as participants in a network of Communist espionage in the very shadow of the Washington Monument. Two of them, Frank Coe and

Solomon Adler, have been for some years working for the Chinese Communists in Asia. From the Morgenthau Diaries we can glean many details of extensive political espionage operations by this group, especially in the area of policy subversion" (p. 3).

These operations, Dr. Kubek continues,

"were first intimated by Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the summer of 1948.

"In the hearings before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on the operations of a Communist group within the Institute of Pacific Relations, White's name came up repeatedly. . . . Subsequently, when the Subcommittee dealt with interlocking subversion in Government departments, its hearing revealed additional data on White's activities and his connection with members of a conspiratorial Communist group operating within the Government. Dr. White was the centre of all this activity. His name was used for references by members of the espionage ring when they made application for Federal employment. He arranged their transfer from bureau to bureau, from department to department. He assigned them to international missions. He vouched for their loyalty and protected them when exposure threatened.

"When the former Communist courier Elizabeth Bentley appeared before the Subcommittee in 1952, she painted a startling picture of the fundamental design of Communist penetration. One of the two espionage groups that she 'handled in Washington' was headed by Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, an official of the Treasury Department. Concerning the avenues for placing people in strategic positions, she said: 'Two of our best ones were Harry Dexter White and Lauchlin Currie. They had an immense amount of influence and knew people, and their word would be accepted when they recommended someone.' Currie, a Canadian-born Harvard economist, fled the United States after testifying one time before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He has lived for years in Colombia, but once had enjoyed access to the inner circle of the Roosevelt administration. He came to Washington in 1934, first to the Treasury and then to the Federal Reserve Board. In 1939 Currie was appointed as one of the six administrative assistants to the President, with special duties in economics. With Currie in the White House and White in the Treasury, the stage was set for the development of what Secretary Hull has called the 'catastrophic' programme for the post-war

disposition of Germany which came to be known as the Morgenthau Plan.

(Hull, *Memoirs*, vol. 1, pp. 207-208). (*Morgenthau Diary*, p. 4)

"Stated in its simplest terms, the objective of the Morgenthau Plan was to de-industrialize Germany and diminish its people to a pastoral existence once the war was won. If this could be accomplished, the militaristic Germans would never rise again to threaten the peace of the world. This was the justification for all the planning, but another motive lurked behind the obvious one. The hidden motive was unmasked in a syndicated column in the *New York Herald Tribune* in September 1946, more than a year after the collapse of the Germans. The real goal of the proposed condemnation of 'all of Germany to a permanent diet of potatoes' was the Communization of the defeated nation. 'The best way for the German people to be driven into the arms of the Soviet Union', it was pointed out, 'was for the United States to stand forth as the champion of indiscriminate and harsh misery in Germany' (Issue of 5th September 1946). And so it then seemed, for in a recent speech Foreign Minister Molotov had declared the hope of the Soviet Union to 'transform' Germany into a 'democratic and peace-loving State which, besides its agriculture, will have its own industry and foreign trade' (10th July 1946). Did Russia really plan on becoming the saviour of the prostrate Germans from the vengeful fate which the United States had concocted for them? If this was indeed a hidden motive in the Morgenthau Plan, what can be said of the principal planner? Was this the motive of Harry Dexter White? Was White acting as a Communist but without specific instructions? Was he acting as a Soviet agent when he drafted the plan? There is no confession in the Morgenthau Diaries in which White admits that he was either ideologically a Communist or actively a Soviet agent. But it is possible, given an understanding of Soviet aims in Europe, to reconstruct from the Diaries how White and certain of his associates in the Treasury worked assiduously to further those aims. From the Diaries, therefore, it is possible to add significant evidence to the testimonies of J. Edgar Hoover and Attorney General Herbert Brownell that Harry Dexter White was ideologically a Communist and actively a Soviet agent from the day he entered the service of the United States Government.

"Before the entrance of the United States into World War II, Secretary Morgenthau's principal efforts were directed at arming the Allies against Japan and Germany. Perhaps no individual was

more committed to assisting the Allies or more ardent in furthering national defence than Morgenthau. At times Secretary Hull was fearful that Morgenthau's crusading fervour might provoke the Axis nations too far. The Diaries show sharp disagreements between the State and Treasury Departments in administering export controls and foreign funds on deposit in the United States. Morgenthau early initiated a struggle to wrest from the State Department its traditional authority over exports and imports of war material in the hope of bringing the office of Arms and Munitions Control under his department. The Secretary of the Treasury had a strong personal taste for diplomatic bargaining and was frequently engaged in discussions with ambassadors or in correspondence with foreign statesmen—activities which, of course, were properly the function of the Secretary of State. Hull warmly resented what he regarded as unwarranted interference in the field of foreign affairs" (*ibid.*, p. 5).

The Treasury went to extraordinary lengths to acquire secret documents not related to its jurisdiction from other Departments, and the Diaries also reveal

"sharp differences between Morgenthau and the Secretary of War, H. L. Stimson, regarding the selection of personnel for postwar planning. Late in 1943 Morgenthau asked the President to name Lauchlin Currie as a representative to the European Advisory Commission meeting in London. The Commission was charged with drafting surrender terms, defining zones of occupation, and formulating plans for Allied administration of Germany. Morgenthau told the President that Currie 'would work well with the Treasury' and that 'we could surround him with three or four men 'to advise him' " (p. 6).

Silvermaster, who was later found to have organized a Communist group within the United States Government for the purpose of obtaining copies of confidential documents and other information for the Russians, was offered an important post in the Treasury Department in 1945.

"In the realm of foreign policy, Silvermaster was also active. He sent Morgenthau a memorandum on 19th June 1945, advising that the immediate problem was the 'establishing of solid Soviet-American friendship'. The man to become the next Secretary of State, he said, should be 'a liberal' and 'someone not anti-Soviet'. President Truman had been 'arduously preparing himself' for the forthcoming meeting at Potsdam with Stalin and Churchill . . .

and it would be extremely desirable if the Chief Executive could 'take a trip through the big industrial plants, mines and devastated areas of the Soviet Union'. This visit would enable the President to acquire the 'actual facts of the Soviet economy and a realistic perspective of Soviet-American trade'. Moreover a trip through the Soviet Union and Siberia would enable the President to return 'from the Big Three meeting with more intimate personal knowledge and direct personal relationship with the key people having a better knowledge than any other American and any Briton'.

"Anyone who studies the Morgenthau Diaries can hardly fail to be deeply impressed by the tremendous power which accumulated in the grasping hands of Dr. Harry Dexter White, who in 1953 was identified by J. Edgar Hoover as a Soviet espionage agent. Following the Munich crisis in the spring of 1938, Secretary Morgenthau invited White to become a regular member of the 9.30 group, made up of his principal advisers. A week after Pearl Harbour the Secretary, in a departmental order, announced that 'on and after this date, Mr. Harry D. White, Assistant to the Secretary, will assume full responsibility for all matters with which the Treasury Department has to deal having a bearing on foreign relations. . . .' The wording of this order is of the greatest significance. White's full responsibility included not only all foreign matters in which the Treasury was specifically engaged, but also any matter 'having a bearing' thereon. To a Communist agent, the opportunities this position offered were incalculable" (p. 8).

Finally, in December 1944 Morgenthau brought pressure to bear on the President to have White nominated Assistant Secretary to the Treasury.

"In order to comprehend the deplorable conditions in Germany following World War II, the influence of the Treasury in the formulation of America's postwar policy must be considered and understood. Most of the documents in the present volume concern the development of the Morgenthau Plan for the postwar control of Germany. The Diaries are full of data illustrating the influence of Harry Dexter White and his colleagues in the formulation of this detailed blueprint for the permanent elimination of Germany as a world power. The benefits which might, and did accrue to the Soviet Union as a result of such Treasury planning, were incalculable. In 1952 Elizabeth Bentley gave an extraordinarily revealing glimpse of how White's hand played a controlling part in the draft of Secretary Morgenthau's programme for the

destruction of Germany. When members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee asked Miss Bentley whether she knew of a similar Morgenthau Plan for the Far East, she gave the Subcommittee the following testimony :

Miss Bentley : No, the only Morgenthau Plan I knew anything about was the German one.

Senator Eastland : Did you know who drew that plan?

Miss Bentley : (It was) Due to Mr. White's influence, to push the devastation of Germany because that was what the Russians wanted.

Senator Eastland : What you say is that it was a Communist plot to destroy Germany and weaken her to where she could not help us?

Miss Bentley : That is correct. She could no longer be a barrier that would protect the Western World.

Senator Eastland : And that Mr. Morgenthau, who was Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, was used by the Communist agents to promote that plot?

Miss Bentley : I am afraid so; yes.

Senator Smith : He was unsuspectingly used.

Senator Ferguson : So you have conscious and unconscious agents?

Miss Bentley : Of course. . . .

(*Morgenthau Diary*, pp. 9, 10)

"When J. Edgar Hoover testified before the Subcommittee on 17th November 1953, he affirmed this testimony. 'All information furnished by Miss Bentley which was susceptible to check', he said, 'has proven to be correct. She has been subjected to the most searching of cross-examinations; her testimony has been evaluated by juries and reviewed by the courts and has been found to be accurate'. Mr. Hoover continued: 'Miss Bentley's account of White's activities was later corroborated by Whittaker Chambers; and the documents in White's own handwriting, concerning which there can be no dispute, lend credibility to the information previously reported on White' " (*ibid.*, p. 11).

Other officials such as Joseph J. O'Connell and Robert McConnell were engaged to draw up a programme for the control of Germany after the war, which envisaged locking up the Ruhr Valley and the removal of all its heavy industry, and some kind of "lump sum payment in the form of German material resources, German human resources and German territory. . . ." Here, then, is the basis of the so-called Morgenthau Plan which proposed to reduce Germany to

an agricultural state. As the Secretary put it, "The policy I want to pursue, and have the Treasury pursue is, I want to let German economy seek its own level and stew in its own juice." White liked the simile. . . .

"The plan which Roosevelt and Churchill approved at the Quebec Conference in September 1944 incorporated many of the basic ideas recommended by McConnell. . . .

"In the meantime the State Department, on 31st July 1944, had completed its own prospectus for postwar Germany. Entitled *Report on Reparation, Restitution and Property Rights—Germany*, it was diametrically opposed to the Treasury plan in that it provided for 'rapid reconstruction and rehabilitation of war-torn areas'. There was to be no 'large-scale and permanent impairment of all German industry'; instead it called for 'eventual integration of Germany into the world economy' (pp. 12, 13).

"White obtained a copy of the State Department prospectus immediately after the Bretton Woods Conference of July 1944, probably from Frank Coe (note 41 in the text states that it might also have been obtained from Harold Glasser). It was to prove perhaps the most important move in his secret career as a Soviet agent. He showed it at once to Morgenthau, who expressed the gravest concern" (pp. 13, 14).

"Accompanied by White, the Secretary made a hurried trip to England in August 1944, to see whether he could reverse some of the planning then underway in the European Advisory Commission. Upon his arrival in London, Morgenthau immediately got in touch with his personal representative on the staff of General Eisenhower, Lt.-Col. Bernard Bernstein, an official to the legal division of the Treasury. . . . Elated by the report that the General was perfectly willing to 'let them stew in their own juice', Morgenthau now had a powerful supporter whom he could use effectively when challenging those individuals in the State or War Departments who advocated a soft peace. On 12th August Secretary Morgenthau called a meeting of various American officials in London who were officially concerned with the problem of postwar Germany. In simple terms he declared . . . that the only way to prevent a third conflagration was to make it impossible for Germany ever to wage war again" (p. 14).

"After listening to both Morgenthau and White describe their plan, Philip Mosely, a State Department adviser, commented that their ideas were 'fantastic, childish and imbecilic'. Such criticism,

however, made no dent in their determination. Regardless of how others might react to their views, they made no modification. 'I thought your ideas were already crystallized by then', White said later to Morgenthau, 'and you were just trying to get their ideas and telling them your ideas'. The nature of Morgenthau's arguments made it difficult to apply a logical analysis. 'When . . . Mr. Morgenthau asserted that Germany should be converted into a purely agricultural country,' recalls Penrose in his *Economic Planning for Peace* (p. 248), 'I remarked that aside from other aspects of the question such a change was impossible because of the ratio of population to cultivable land. His rejoinder was that the surplus population should be dumped into North Africa. Such a discussion was not worth pursuing.' After his return from England, Morgenthau was visibly disturbed. The President, he thought, would have to intercede. 'He will have to get awfully busy', Morgenthau told his staff. 'There isn't anything in regard to Germany which is being carried out. I am going to tell Hull so because his boys are the worst. . . . It is going to be a nice WPA job.' Dan W. Bell agreed. He was sure, he said, that the State Department wanted to 'string out a pretty strong Germany' between the United States and Soviet Russia.

"Morgenthau now called upon Secretary Hull to tell of his experiences in London. He explained that he had asked General Eisenhower to give his view as to how the Germans should be treated after the surrender—and that the Supreme Commander had emphatically declared that Germany should 'stew in its own juice' for several months following the Allied entry" (pp. 15, 16).

"A few days later at a luncheon with Stimson, Morgenthau was horrified to learn that the Secretary of War was thinking of maintaining the social status quo in the Saar Basin under some kind of international control. . . . 'Don't you think the thing to do', he suggested, 'is to take a leaf from Hitler's book and completely remove these children from their parents and make them wards of the state, and have ex-US Army officers, English Army officers, and Russian Army officers run these schools, and have these children learn the true spirit of democracy?' When Stimson replied that he had not really given it much thought, Morgenthau announced that he was going to take the initiative in asking State, War and Treasury to work together on a plan for postwar Germany. He neglected to say that Treasury officials had been working on such a plan for more than a year.

"Early in 1944 the 'German Country Unit' was set up in

London under Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF), to draft exact plans for the military occupation of Germany . . . three drafts of a *Handbook for Military Government in Germany* were prepared . . . and a copy was probably handed to Morgenthau by his personal agent in Europe, Colonel Bernstein. The *Handbook* offered a glimpse of a very different kind of occupation than Treasury officials were hoping for. Its tone was moderate and lenient throughout" (pp. 16, 17).

However "according to an authority on the subject, 'the influence of the Morgenthau group was sufficient to hold the necessary authorization up'. (Harold Zink: *American Military Government in Germany*, p. 20) . . . Morgenthau asked White to prepare a memorandum for the President pointing out the weaknesses of the proposed programme for occupation. . . . Impressed by the memorandum, the President killed the *Handbook* and sent a stinging memorandum to Secretary Stimson, a copy of which was sent to Hull . . . concluding with the words 'The German people as a whole must have it driven home to them that the whole nation has been engaged in a lawless conspiracy against the decencies of modern civilization'. Thus both Hull and Stimson were put on notice by the President that State and War Departments must develop harsher attitudes towards Germany or be bypassed in the formulation of that policy (pp. 17, 18).

"It is indeed remarkable how the Treasury intervened and eventually got the War Department to alter its basic policy on postwar Germany. 'If we hadn't gone to England,' Morgenthau told his staff, ' . . . they would have gone ahead and carried out what was in that *Handbook*'" (p. 19).

"According to Lt.-Col. John Boettiger, the President's son-in-law, Bernstein was recognized throughout the European theatre as representing Morgenthau's views, and was considered an 'extremist'. He was later to be identified by the Subcommittee as a strong supporter of pro-Communist causes. He vigorously defended the Soviet Union, for example, in its methods of carrying out the Potsdam Agreement. 'Only the Russians', the *Daily Worker* of 21st February 1946 reported him as saying, 'have shown that they mean to exterminate Fascism and Nazism.'

"The influence of the Secretary of the Treasury in the making of American policy is dramatically illustrated in the unusual position held by Colonel Bernstein. Where other officials of the planning agency of the US Group Control Council in London had few direct contacts with Washington, Bernstein maintained the

most intimate contacts with Morgenthau, White and other Treasury officials. He could communicate all developments in planning directly to them, and could at any time demand transportation to and from Washington. He was very active in propaganda . . . and in influencing the revision of documents in connection with the new German programme. Most of the personnel in Bernstein's office came directly from the Treasury" (p. 20).

"Another of White's protégés who played a role of some significance was Irving Kaplan, the Treasury representative on the Foreign Funds Control Section of the US Group Control Council. One of White's closest associates, he had tremendous responsibilities for American occupation policy in Germany. . . . When Kaplan went to the Treasury in June 1945, it was Frank Coe who appointed him. Coe was identified by Miss Bentley as a Soviet espionage agent" (pp. 21, 22).

"In the realm of finance, of course, the Secretary of the Treasury would naturally be involved in the postwar treatment of Germany. But Morgenthau delved deeply into matters altogether unrelated to economics (p. 22). . . . In the last few months of 1944 White kept his entire staff busy in the preparation of American policy for postwar Germany. On 28th August one of his subordinates, H. J. Bitterman, submitted a memorandum on the partitioning of Germany which included a map of the proposed division. In Bitterman's memorandum the full recognition of Soviet Russia's claim to German Territory was taken for granted.

"Recommendations by other departments on postwar treatment of Germany were constantly challenged by Treasury officials as being too soft. The State Department, for example, prepared such a draft on 1st September 1944, entitled 'American policy for Treatment of Germany after Surrender', which urged the government to decide . . . 'what kind of economic structure it proposes to leave to Germany'. If a far-reaching programme of industrial destruction or dismantlement was agreed upon, it would 'bring about extensive and important changes in European economy as a whole'. Since Germany was deficient in foodstuffs, it was doubtful that 'a plan of making Germany predominantly agricultural' could be put into effect without the liquidation or emigration of many millions of Germans. Furthermore, since Germany was an important producer of coal and bauxite for Europe, a 'wrecking programme' might have repercussions in considerable European opposition on account of its effect on the continental economy.

Moreover, if a programme of reparations was to be adopted, the destruction of German industry would make it impractical if not impossible.

"Morgenthau and White disagreed with this analysis. They were anxious to have their own programme adopted by the President before State or War could effectively interfere (p. 23).

"On 1st September the Treasury team completed a draft entitled 'Suggested Post-Surrender Programme for Germany', and rushed it to Morgenthau. . . . A few passages reveal the kind of programme that White and his associates were designing. . . . It meant the 'total destruction' of the entire German armament industry. The Ruhr should not only be 'stripped of all presently existing industries' but so 'weakened and controlled' that it could not in the foreseeable future become an effective industrial area. All its plants should either be 'completely dismantled' or 'completely destroyed', and its mines should be 'wrecked'.

"The next day White presented this draft at a meeting of State, War and Treasury officials called by Harry Hopkins in his office at the White House. Subsequently, White's draft was incorporated in the so-called Morgenthau Plan as revealed at the Quebec Conference. Essentially the plan was built on vengeance rather than on any principle of sound economics. It was quite blind in its failure to consider the fundamental fact that the victorious Allies, by striking at Germany, would be striking at the economic heart of all Europe. The economy of Europe, which had depended for generations on certain raw materials from Germany, would now be frightfully crippled. Moreover, the implementation of the Treasury plan could have no other result than to leave the Soviet Union in an unchallenged position to dominate Central Europe.

"Closely associated with White in preparing the Treasury draft was Dr. Harold Glasser, an economist in the department since 1936 (p. 24) . . . the Diaries frequently mention Glasser as contributing to the formulation of postwar schemes for the control of Germany. According to the testimony of Elizabeth Bentley, Glasser was actually a member of a Communist cell (p. 25).

"Regarding the punishment of Nazi leaders, White now suggested that a list of 'war criminals' be prepared and presented to American officers on the spot, who could properly identify the guilty and shoot them on sight. John Pehle, the Treasury lawyer, remarked that this was a fine idea, but added: 'If anything is done, it has to be done right away, or nothing will be done'" (p. 26).

Throughout the discussions Morgenthau and White incessantly came back to the plan of totally destroying the industrial resources of the Saar and Ruhr valleys. Morgenthau categorically stated that he would make the Ruhr "a ghost area" (p. 29), and that its fifteen million inhabitants could be fed out of American Army soup kitchens (p. 27).

"Such was the character of Secretary Morgenthau's views on the treatment of postwar Germany. Never in American history had there been proposed a more vindictive programme for a defeated nation. With the Treasury exerting unprecedented influence in determining American policy toward Germany, such fallacies of logic, evasion of issues and deliberate disregard of essential economic relationships were manifested in the postwar plan as finally adopted. As it resulted, no paper of any importance dealing with the occupation of Germany could be released until approved by the Treasury. The State and War Departments became virtually subservient to the Treasury in this area of their responsibility. At an interdepartmental meeting on 2nd September 1944, Harry Dexter White gave what James Riddleberger, the German expert of the Department of State, called 'a rather lengthy interpretation of his plan which, in its general tenor, was more extreme than the Treasury memorandum itself' (p. 29).

"The difference of views within the Cabinet came to a head when Harry Hopkins, the President's representative, met with Morgenthau, Stimson and Hull in the latter's office the next day. . . . While Hull favoured the elimination of Germany as a dominant economic power in Europe, he nevertheless suggested the establishment of a subsistence standard of living. Morgenthau, on the other hand, insisted that the German population be placed on a starvation diet. Stimson agreed with Hull's recommendations except that he preferred a high standard of living. 'The way to meet the Germans', he said, was through 'principles of Christianity and kindness'. Stimson's remarks aroused the wrath of Morgenthau and Hopkins, both of whom insisted upon the total elimination of Germany as a European economic factor and a less than subsistence diet for its people. Hopkins even argued against 'any steel mills at all' in postwar Germany. Stimson's persistent opposition to the Morgenthau Plan is one of the cardinal revelations of the Diaries. Dead set against the Treasury programme for 'locking up' the Ruhr, he predicted that 'thirty million people will starve if the Ruhr is closed down' (p. 30).

"On 6th September Morgenthau, Hull and Stimson met with

the President. Morgenthau continued to press for an unrelenting policy toward Germany. . . . The President agreed that the Ruhr should be dismantled in order that its products might be used to 'furnish raw material for the British steel industry' . . . but Stimson came away from the meeting with a feeling that he had made some impact on the President. Morgenthau . . . promptly requested another meeting on 9th September.

"On 8th September Morgenthau explained to Hull 'how we got the War Department' to change its Proclamation No. 1, a directive to General Eisenhower. Actually the change in the proclamation was at the suggestion of White. The first paragraph of Proclamation No. 1, as drafted by Eisenhower's staff, to be issued by General Eisenhower upon entering Germany, read as follows :

The Allied forces serving under my command have now entered Germany. We come as conquerors; but not as oppressors. In the areas of Germany occupied by the forces under my command as in other countries liberated from the horrors of Nazi tyranny, we shall overthrow the Nazi rule, dissolve the Nazi party, and abolish the cruel, oppressive and discriminatory laws and institutions which the party has created. Party leaders, the Gestapo, and others suspected of crimes and atrocities will be tried and, if guilty, punished.

"The paragraph as drafted by the Treasury runs as follows :

The Allied forces serving under my command have now entered Germany. We come as militant victors to ensure that Germany shall never again (where the words were originally "drench the world in blood" they are crossed out and written above them are the words "plunge the world into war"). The German people must never again become the carriers of death, horror and wanton destruction to civilization. . . . As conquerors our aim is not oppression but the obliteration of every vestige of Nazism and militarism from Germany. The cruel and barbaric laws and institutions of Nazism will be abolished. Party leaders, the Gestapo, and those guilty of crimes and atrocities will be punished. (The next sentence, which has been deleted, runs) Hitler and the other arch criminals of this war will be put to death (p. 32).

"That same day White, who had the Treasury plan almost ready in draft, advised Morgenthau on how to proceed", and told him that Taylor, Glasser and DuBois, who were all shown to have pro-Communist records, were working with him on the plan, which by now they were calling the Black Book. "Morgenthau then invited White, DuBois and Taylor to dinner . . . the Black Book was discussed, and suggestions were offered as to how it

could be used effectively at the Quebec Conference. On 9th September Morgenthau met again with his staff before going to the White House. To make certain that he was fully briefed, Morgenthau reviewed the Black Book in detail. . . . At the President's office later that day, Morgenthau and Stimson presented their opposite views. Stimson objected vigorously to the Treasury recommendation for the wrecking of the Ruhr. 'I am unalterably opposed to such a programme', he declared (p. 33).

"When the President left Washington that same evening of 9th September for the historic meeting with Prime Minister Churchill at Quebec, he took with him a copy of the Black Book. Morgenthau accompanied Roosevelt to the railway station and then decided to ride north himself. When the train stopped overnight at Hyde Park, Morgenthau went to his own farm a few miles away. But he did not tarry long at Fishkill Hook. As Roosevelt's longtime friend he well knew how easily the President could be sidetracked, and this time no one was going to get the chance. (F. Smith, *The Rise and Fall of the Morgenthau Plan*, article in *United Nations World*, March 1947, p. 37.)

"Three days later Roosevelt wired Morgenthau: 'Please be in Quebec by Thursday, 14th September noon.' At once Morgenthau decided that White also should go. As they packed for the trip they did not neglect to include a copy of the Black Book for presentation to Lord Cherwell, one of Churchill's closest advisers.

"The plan for postwar Germany as presented at the Quebec Conference was precisely that which was outlined in the Black Book of Harry Dexter White and his associates. This plan called for a repudiation of the Atlantic Charter signed by Roosevelt and Churchill three years before. The Atlantic Charter had pledged that the United States and Great Britain would 'endeavour . . . to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, of materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity'. The Treasury plan now would deprive millions of Europeans of such basic economic rights. It was Morgenthau's difficult task at Quebec to justify the plan to Churchill, who thought it far too drastic. According to Morgenthau's recollection, the Prime Minister was 'violent in the most foul language'. He declared that the American proposals were like 'chaining his body to a dead German', and were 'cruel, unchristian'. As Morgenthau hammered on the idea that the destruction of the Ruhr would create new markets for Britain after the war, Churchill gradually changed his attitude (p. 34). When Anthony Eden objected strenuously to Churchill's

reversal, the Prime Minister retorted: 'If it gets down to the question of whether I am for the German people or the English people, I am for the English people, and you can be for whom-ever you want.' Then he added this warning: 'And I don't want you to tell the War Cabinet about Morgenthau's proposal until I get home.'

"What prompted Churchill to change his mind and accept the Treasury plan? Is it because Harry Dexter White had intimated to Lord Cherwell, who was at Churchill's side at Quebec, that if the Prime Minister approved the American plan the British could have the large loan they were seeking? Morgenthau felt that some kind of guarantee of continuing financial aid, even beyond the end of the war, was 'uppermost' in Churchill's mind. The Diaries reveal that Morgenthau himself talked with Cherwell and asked him to 'speak to Churchill' which he did, and the next morning Churchill changed his mind. Morgenthau states that the 'Memorandum on Lend-lease was not drafted until the final day and that Churchill had agreed to the policy on Germany prior to the final drafting of this memorandum' (Book 773, p. 4). Moreover, the Diaries show that Churchill was promised a loan of \$6.5 billion to tide Britain over during the period from the end of the war in Europe to the surrender of Japan. Later, in a meeting with Secretary Stimson, Morgenthau denied that he had dangled such an inducement before the Prime Minister. When Stimson asked which had come first, the Treasury plan or the proposal for a loan, Morgenthau replied that Churchill 'came across' before 'we agreed' on the loan. White, who was present, remained discreetly silent, but later he reminded Morgenthau that Churchill had given his oral approval to the Treasury plan only after receiving a pledge of continuing American financial support (p. 35). . . . 'If I may remind you,' White said to Morgenthau, 'you put special stress on *when* they signed the document, but what Churchill said to the President when he was trying to get the President to agree on the document (the loan), you remember, he said: What do you want me to do, stand up and beg like Fala? And the document was signed on the Lend-lease after, but there practically was an oral commitment *before* then. It was just to be put in writing.'

"By White's own admission, therefore, Morgenthau did offer Churchill a loan in exchange for his approval of the Treasury plan for postwar Germany. But more important are these questions: Did White advise or encourage or prompt Morgenthau on how to deal with Churchill, whom he must have known would present an obstacle? What discussions did White have with

Cherwell behind the scenes? What was the precise role of White at the Quebec Conference? At present these questions cannot be answered because the official papers of the conference have yet to be published.

"Although foreign affairs and military matters were discussed in depth at the Quebec Conference, neither Hull nor Stimson were in attendance. The Treasury Department took precedence over State and War in negotiations regarding Germany. The commitments made by Roosevelt and Churchill were of greatest importance to White and his associates, who from the very beginning advocated the total destruction of Germany. To make certain that the British would fulfil their commitments under the Treasury plan, White recommended his long-time Treasury associate Frank Coe to act as secretary of the US delegation in future Lend-lease negotiations with Britain. (Coe, identified by Elizabeth Bentley as having been a member of the Silvermaster cell, subsequently fled the United States and now resides in Communist China where he writes 'agit prop' for the Chinese Communists.) The position was a critical one, since in it Coe would have control of the formulation of policy on all matters of future British Lend-lease" (p. 36).

Morgenthau summed up his success in these words:

"As far as I went personally, it was the high spot of my whole career in the Government. I got more personal satisfaction out of those forty-eight hours than with anything I have ever been connected with . . . the President put it this way. He said he had been groping for something, and we came along and gave him just what he wanted. But I don't know how they are going to announce it or what they are going to do about it. . . ."

"The effects of Morgenthau's victory at Quebec were quickly felt . . . and caused an irreparable division among policymakers in Washington. The old cleavage between Hull and Stimson on the one side, and Morgenthau on the other, became hopelessly deep when the President bypassed both the State and War Departments by asking the Secretary of the Treasury to present his plan at Quebec. Hull later wrote:

"This whole development at Quebec, I believe, angered me as much as anything that had happened during my career as Secretary of State. If the Morgenthau Plan leaked out, as it inevitably would—and shortly did—it might well mean a bitter-end German resistance that could cause the loss of thousands of American lives."

(Hull: *Memoirs*, vol. II, p. 1614)

"Hull felt strongly that Morgenthau should have been kept out of the field of general policy, and so did Stimson. When Stimson heard of the President's endorsement of the Treasury plan at Quebec, he quickly drafted another critical memorandum, though it must have seemed to him a waste of time to do so. Yet this refutation of the 'pastoral plan' for Germany remains the most powerful ever presented to the President (p. 37):

"... I still feel that the course proposed by the Treasury would in the long run certainly defeat what we hope to attain by a complete military victory, that is, the peace of the world, and the assurance of social, economic and political stability in the world. . . . I cannot believe that they (the Treasury proposals) will make for a lasting peace. In spirit and in emphasis they are punitive, not, in my judgement, corrective or constructive. They will tend through bitterness and suffering to breed another war, not to make another war undesired by the Germans or impossible in fact . . . the question is not whether we want Germans to suffer for their sins. Many of us would like to see them suffer the tortures they have inflicted on others. The only question is whether over the years a group of seventy million educated, efficient and imaginative people can be kept within bounds on such a low level of subsistence as the Treasury proposals contemplate. I do not believe that is humanly possible. . . . Enforced poverty . . . destroys the spirit not only of the victim but debases the victor . . . it would be a crime against civilization itself."

"Secretary Morgenthau disagreed very strongly with Stimson's views. He instructed White to study Stimson's record, while he was Secretary of State under President Hoover, in order to 'dig up' something that would indicate why he opposed the Treasury plan. 'I know he went and visited with Mussolini', Morgenthau commented briskly, because 'somebody said to me: you ought to look up Stimson's record on reparations, and you will find how bad he was, and he hasn't changed any since then' (p. 38).

"On 20th September White drafted a memorandum which Morgenthau submitted to the President. . . . Stimson, White held, completely misunderstood the Treasury plan, which was not 'punitive' but 'highly humanitarian'.

"The public reception in the United States of the so-called Morgenthau Plan was adverse but not wholly unfavourable. It was generally felt that the German people were collectively guilty of war crimes, and many Americans therefore tended to favour a hard peace. But the programme which White and Morgenthau

were advocating . . . was the most punitive which could possibly have been designed. But could such a policy be made to stick? The Germans would certainly resist it, and with increasing determination as the postwar period dragged on. Was this, in fact, the secret intention of White and his Communist friends? Did they hope for a revolt in the Western zone of occupation in order to make the Russians look like liberators? By identifying American and British statesmen with what Cordell Hull called a 'catastrophic' policy, it would be possible to keep alive the hate of the German people against the Western democracies for years to come . . . from this angle therefore, the Treasury plan could result in nothing but diplomatic disaster for the United States.

"By 21st September the story of the President's acceptance of the Morgenthau Plan had leaked to the press . . . which was almost unanimous in violent opposition to the plan" (p. 39).

In view of the forthcoming presidential elections, Morgenthau was particularly concerned at a series of critical articles written by Arthur Krock in the *New York Times*, and was puzzled as to how the newspaper's publisher, Arthur Sulzberger, who "wants to see the President elected", could "run a story like that." . . . Morgenthau tried hard to find out where Krock had obtained such detailed information on the Quebec negotiations, which were supposed to have been secret (p. 40).

"As a result German resistance was strengthened. The Nazi radio was shouting day and night that the Germans would become starving peasants if they surrendered. General Marshall complained to Morgenthau that just as the Army placed loudspeakers on the front urging the Germans to surrender, Krock's articles appeared and stiffened the will of the Germans to resist . . . There is no question that the leakage to the press was disastrous to the war effort, for nothing could have been greater in its psychological impact upon Germany than the news of Morgenthau's coup at Quebec in September 1944. Until then there was a fair chance, according to intelligence reports, that the Germans might discontinue resistance to American and British forces while holding the Russians at bay in the east in order to avoid the frightful fate of a Soviet occupation. This could have shortened the war by months and could have averted the spawning of a malignant Communism in East Germany which has plagued Europe for the past twenty years. According to Lt.-Col. John Boettiger, the President's son-in-law, the Morgenthau Plan was worth 'thirty divisions to the Germans'.

"As ardent as ever in his devotion to the President, Morgenthau was increasingly worried about the reaction of the American public to his plan in the forthcoming elections. At the same time he was fearful that if all the details were revealed, the plan 'really may be hurt'. He hoped that the President would command Stimson and Hull to stop the leaks" (p. 41).

Above all he was afraid that Krock's articles would influence the President to change the plan. He thought that Krock's inference that British approval of the plan had been purchased was "so dirty" (p. 42), and he was also very upset by a letter published in the *New York Times* on 9th October 1944 by Calvin Hoover, recently appointed head of the Intelligence Group on the Control Council for Germany, in which he stated:

"The publication of Secretary Morgenthau's plan for dealing with Germany has disturbed me deeply . . . such a Carthaginian peace would leave a legacy of hate to poison international relations for generations to come . . .' (p. 42).

"This prediction of a 'legacy of hate' seemed valid, for in Germany the controlled Nazi press was having a field day. The headlines screamed: 'Morgenthau surpasses Clemenceau' and 'Roosevelt and Churchill agree at Quebec to the Jewish Murder Plan'. Hitler's chief of propaganda, Dr. Goebbels, made good use of the Morgenthau Plan as a rallying cry to the German people to put up a last-ditch resistance. This they did, for seven months more—while American bombers flattened and burned dozens of German cities and hundreds of industrial plants which American taxpayers would one day be called upon to help rebuild in order to correct the imbalance in Europe which, by a monumental miscalculation, their victory had achieved.

"The whole question of how to treat defeated Germany was in constant dispute between the Treasury and the State and the War Departments for many months. The Diaries are full of memoranda on this controversy. Yet these policy disputes encompassed much more than the fate of Germany alone; the future of the entire continent of Europe was involved . . . the acceptance of the Treasury plan by Roosevelt and Churchill at Quebec greatly strengthened Morgenthau and his colleagues during subsequent interdepartmental negotiations. They won many concessions. After the adverse press reaction, the President kept a judicious silence. He did not publicly repudiate the Treasury plan, just as he never publicly announced it. . . . Careful to give no affront to Morgenthau in his campaign speeches, the President did not

commit himself beyond promising that the German people were 'not going to be enslaved'. 'Enslaved' was a word one could take as one chose. The Quebec Agreement was in fact signed only one month before President Roosevelt's address to the Foreign Policy Association in New York assuring the world that 'we bring no charge against the German race as such. The German people are not going to be enslaved—because the United Nations do not traffic in slavery'.

(G. Stolper : *German Realities*, p. 15) (p. 43)

"How the Treasury officials were able to integrate the basic features of their plan into the military directive, originally prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and known as JCS 1067, is fully disclosed in the Diaries. White saw to it that many elements of his thinking were embodied in JCS 1067 . . . which General Eisenhower received upon entering Germany and which legally controlled American activities there after the surrender. However it might be read, JCS 1067 reflected the harsh philosophy of quarantine and revenge, devised and advocated by Morgenthau, White and the Treasury staff. It is very important, therefore, to grasp the fact that the revised directive of 22nd September 1944 became an official but diluted version of the Morgenthau Plan, and remained formally in effect until supplanted by a new policy directive from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in July 1947.

"In the two full years that JCS 1067 was the cornerstone of American policy in Germany, Communist infiltration into the American Military Government was a very serious problem. The harshness of the Army directive made it possible for Communist infiltration to succeed. As Germany was punished and substantially dismantled in accord with the basic tenets of the Morgenthau Plan, the American zone of occupation enabled the Communists in the military-government to influence policy in the direction of Soviet desires. . . . Under the philosophy of this directive, the Germans were regarded collectively as guilty of crimes against humanity and as a menace to the world, and as such they were to be dealt with very firmly. Punishment was to be meted out to the German people as a whole by reducing their standard of living drastically (p. 44).

"JCS 1067 constituted what may be called without exaggeration a heavy millstone around the neck of the American military government. It may well rank among the most discreditable state documents ever written. . . . Immediately after the victory of Roosevelt in the November election, White and his colleagues

renewed their efforts to drive through the Treasury programme for the permanent destruction of Germany. Through various channels White had gathered information concerning the kind of policy directives other departments had in preparation. This he was able to achieve through a system of 'trading' which Morgenthau had initiated at his suggestion" (p. 45).

Morgenthau requested of his collaborators that the reunions which they held together should be kept rigorously secret, except for the Russians to whom a certain amount of information was subsequently communicated. However, the Allied military became more and more insistent on the vital necessity of reconstructing German industry so that she could supply the devastated regions of Europe. But Morgenthau was kept informed of every initiative taken by the Army in this respect through the agency of high officials who had access to the most secret information.

The majority of them, such as William Henry Taylor, Harold Glasser, Frank Coe, William Ludwig Ullmann, Abraham George Silverman, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster and Lauchlin Currie were identified as belonging to the Communist network in the United States, and passed before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948 and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1953.

"On 10th January 1945, Morgenthau submitted a strong memorandum to the President emphasizing Treasury fears of a new militarism in Germany . . . and went on boldly to challenge the motives of those who were opposing pastoralization. ' . . . the real motive of most of those who oppose a weak Germany . . . is simply an expression of fear of Russia and Communism. It is the 20-year-old idea of a 'bulwark against Bolshevism—which was one of the factors that brought this present war down on us.' His conclusion was ominous: 'There is nothing that I can think of that can do more this moment to engender trust or distrust between the United States and Russia than the position this Government takes on the German problem' (p. 53).

"James C. Dunn, State Department political adviser on European Affairs, declared his surprise over the implication of the Treasury which charged that those who opposed the Morgenthau Plan were anti-Russian (p. 54).

"To show Morgenthau that the Treasury plan had at least the endorsement of some Soviet officials, Herbert Gaston submitted a memorandum on 25th January 1945, describing a talk with Ladimir Pravbin of TASS. . . . Pravbin's remarks had convinced

him, Gaston said, that Soviet ideas on postwar treatment of Germany checked 'very closely with yours'.

"Morgenthau was not in the entourage, but Harry Hopkins, who had worked with White on the plan just before Quebec, would be at the President's side at Yalta. . . . There is no question that Churchill came to Yalta quite determined to curb the Russians; the same cannot be said of Roosevelt. The difference is that Roosevelt had been influenced strongly by the Treasury plan for postwar Germany, as concocted by White and advanced assiduously by Morgenthau for the past six months (p. 55).

"Stalin's first demand was the 'dismemberment' of Germany. . . . Roosevelt then suggested that the Big Three foreign ministers be asked to produce a scheme 'for studying the question within twenty-four hours, and a definite plan for dismemberment within a month' (W. Churchill: *Memoirs of the Second World War*, p. 915). This was faster than Churchill liked, but Roosevelt had been hearing about and looking at such a 'definite plan' for many months. It was the Treasury plan of Harry Dexter White and Secretary Morgenthau. Stalin's second demand, just as urgent, was for reparations. . . .

"Many admirers of Franklin Roosevelt have long insisted that the war-time President promptly and properly rejected the Morgenthau Plan after flirting briefly with it before and during the Quebec Conference of September 1944 (p. 56).

"The President's performance at Yalta indicates the opposite. The spirit of the Morgenthau Plan, and many of its particulars, are reflected in the decision made in the Crimea. Admiral Leahy, who was there as the President's naval aide, thought that he had witnessed 'a frightening sowing of dragon's teeth that carried germs of an appalling war of revenge at some time in the distant future' (W. Leahy: *I Was There*, pp. 322-323). In his book *Beyond Containment*, pp. 34-46, William H. Chamberlain assesses Yalta as a tragedy of appeasement: '. . . The Yalta Agreement . . . represented in two of its features the endorsement by the United States of the principal of human slavery. One of these features was the recognition that German labour could be used as a source of reparations. . . . And the agreement that Soviet citizens who were found in the Western zones of occupation should be handed over to the Soviet authorities amounted, for the many Soviet refugees who did not wish to return, to the enactment of a fugitive slave law'. This assessment is substantially correct.

"The most important proof that the Morgenthau Plan was influential at the Yalta Conference is to be found in the reaction

of Treasury officials themselves to the Yalta decisions. Five weeks after the Crimea meeting Morgenthau sat down with his staff to compare the official American attitude on Germany as formulated at Quebec and at Yalta. . . . On each point Coe found the Yalta decisions compatible with and corollary to the Quebec decisions.

"After President Roosevelt returned from Yalta, State Department officials grasped an opportunity to push through their own programme for postwar Germany. On 10th March Secretary Stettinius submitted for the President's consideration the draft of a new policy directive for the military occupation of Germany. . . . Realizing that there would be fundamental objections to their programme from the Treasury, they purposely did not consult with Treasury officials. The memorandum of 10th March was a reasonable substitute for the rigorous JCS 1067 which was so pleasing to Morgenthau and White. It was based on the central concept that Germany was important to the economic recovery of Europe. It provided for joint Allied control of defeated Germany, preservation of a large part of German industry, and a 'minimum standard of living' for the German people. The memorandum had no provision for dismemberment, and Germany was to begin 'paying her own way as soon as possible' (pp. 57, 58).

"When Morgenthau saw a copy of the State Department memorandum, he became so furious that he immediately telephoned Assistant Secretary of War McCloy to voice his complaints. . . . He then complained directly to Stettinius. 'I feel that this is a completely different philosophy . . . and I can't approve it.'

"The State Department plan, if adopted, would have spelled complete defeat for Morgenthau and White. . . . For his part, Morgenthau wasted no time in getting directly to the President. He immediately ordered his colleagues to prepare a 'paragraph by paragraph' refutation showing where the State Department memorandum differed from the accepted philosophy of JCS 1067 (p. 58).

"In an emergency meeting on 19th March, Morgenthau obtained from White, Coe and Harold Glasser their best advice on how to approach the President. . . . The next day, armed with these arguments, Morgenthau hurried to the White House. He was surprised to find there Roosevelt's daughter and her husband, Major John Boettiger, whose presence evidently disturbed the Secretary very much. The Boettigers were then living at the White House and caring for the President, whose health by this time was faltering to the point where mental lapses could be expected. . . .

Did the Soviets know what the American people did not know—that Roosevelt was close to death and liable to blackouts at any moment? (p. 59).

"The next day, 21st March, an interdepartmental meeting was held for the purpose of discussing the State Department memorandum . . . and Treasury was represented by the triumvirate of Coe, Glasser and DuBois. . . . The 'major issue', as DuBois called it, ended in a resounding triumph for the Treasury on 23rd March. That day Morgenthau reported jubilantly to his colleagues that the President had been persuaded to 'recall' the State Department memorandum of 10th March, and that he had 'wholly accepted the one which was done here last night with White, Glasser and DuBois working on it' (p. 60).

"For White and his associates the President's action spelled a victory of profound importance . . . but success would not be complete, Morgenthau added, until certain people occupying key positions had been removed from the government. His concluding comment comprises a remarkably intemperate statement of his political philosophy and includes some of the strongest language to be found in the Diaries: 'It is very encouraging that we had the President to back us up . . . they tried to get him to change, and they couldn't—the State Department crowd. Sooner or later the President just has to clean his house, I mean the vicious crowd. . . . And they are for Herbert Hoover, and Herbert Hoover got us in this mess, and they are Fascists at heart . . . it is just a vicious crowd, and sooner or later they have to be rooted out. It was that crowd that fought us with no rules. . . .' The State Department was sorely disappointed that the President had rejected their 10th March memorandum (p. 61).

"A cardinal point of dispute between the Treasury and the Department of War resided in the question of the treatment of German war criminals. As early as 9th September 1944 Stimson had instructed a team of military lawyers to study in detail the possibilities of a mass trial which would prove that Nazism had developed into a conspiracy to wage a totalitarian war of aggression. Hoping to keep the President from any hasty decision on war criminals at the forthcoming Quebec Conference, Stimson carried his views to the White House. He emphasized to the President the advantage of such a trial as against the 'shoot on sight' policy advocated by Morgenthau. One of the recommendations in the Morgenthau memorandum of 6th September was that a list should be made of German archcriminals, and upon their capture and identification they should be executed at once. Contradicting this,

Stimson wrote: "The method of dealing with these and other criminals requires careful thought and a well-defined procedure. Such procedure must embody at least the rudimentary aspects of the Bill of Rights, namely, notification of the accused of the charge, the right to be heard, and, within reasonable limits, to call witnesses in his defence" (p. 62).

"A memorandum debunking Stimson's 'legalistic position' was prepared . . . but by this time Roosevelt was dead, Truman was in the White House, and Morgenthau did not see fit to present the argument (p. 63).

"Another subject of controversy between the Treasury on the one side and State and War on the other was the question of reparations . . . the Secretary of the Treasury boldly proposed the actual cession of German territory to the victors, and the use of forced German labour to rebuild areas devastated by Hitler's armies and to work the soil of liberated countries to produce food for their peoples. Morgenthau and White were dead set against the old concept of long-term reparations payments because such annual tribute would necessitate the rebuilding of industry on a large scale in Germany. . . . On the other hand, the State Department, supported by War, advocated establishing 'widespread controls of large sectors of the German economy' . . . in order to prevent mass starvation. . . . The President had stated his wish that the German authorities, 'to the fullest extent practicable', should be ordered to proclaim and assume administration of such controls (p. 64).

"Dr. Lubin, who was appointed on 12th March 1945 (to the US delegation to the Reparations Commission), had long been interested in Russian affairs. As early as 1930, as reported in the *Daily Worker*, he had spoken under the auspices of the Friends of the Soviet Union, an organization cited as subversive by the Attorney General. . . . Lubin had known Harry Dexter White for years. . . . With the aid of his friends in the Treasury, Lubin now prepared a memorandum for the President stating that the reparations programme as advocated by the State Department would leave Germany with enough industry to recover her war potential" (p. 65).

Which provoked heated discussions with other members of the Cabinet.

"On 10th April a 'top secret' document, over the signature of DuBois, was circulated to the Department of State, War, Navy, and the Foreign Economic Administration, containing suggested

provisions to be appended to the reparations directive. Among these additions was the curious concept of human reparations—the idea that a large labour force, to be supplied by the Germans ‘to meet the claims of other countries’ for damages, should be recruited primarily from ‘Nazi groups, the Gestapo, SS organizations, officers of the Wehrmacht, and those elements of the population who have co-operated in financing and building up the Nazi machine’. A week later DuBois and Glasser reported to Morgenthau that State and War officials were attempting to prevent any ‘really effective reparations programme’ and had ‘objected strenuously’ to the Treasury argument that reparations should ‘start as soon as possible’ ” (p. 66).

Clayton, representing State, offered the principal resistance.

“Meanwhile, on the 21st, the powerful New York financier, Bernard Baruch, acting in his capacity as adviser to the President, met with the War Cabinet and was asked where he stood on the German problem. According to Morgenthau’s report to his staff, Baruch replied that his recent trip to Europe had made him much stronger for the decentralization of Germany than when he left. The Treasury plan was much too soft, Baruch said, and its author practically a ‘sissy’. He would ‘cut his (Clayton’s) heart out if he doesn’t behave himself’, the financial wizard declared, adding ominously: ‘he won’t be able to stay around Washington after I get through with him.’ Clayton had either to get ‘right’ on this German thing’ or ‘leave town’. Baruch was adamant. ‘All I have got to live for now’, he said, ‘is to see that Germany is de-industrialized and that it’s done the right way, and I won’t let anybody get in my way’. He became so emotional that tears came to his eyes. ‘I have never heard a man talk so strongly as he did’, exulted Morgenthau, adding that he ‘got the feeling from Baruch that he realizes the importance of being friendly with Russia. . . .’

“Careful not to jeopardize postwar relations with the Soviet Union, Treasury officials frequently expressed their fears of Western encirclement of Russia. On 24th April 1945, DuBois submitted a memorandum to Morgenthau describing his sympathetic views of Soviet Russia. He thought that those individuals in the American government who wished to restore Germany were motivated by the idea that a strong Reich was necessary as a ‘bulwark against Russia’ . . . and that this attitude was certainly responsible for many of the current difficulties between Washington and Moscow (p. 67).

"Presidential adviser Lauchlin Currie expressed similar fears of the West 'ganging up' on Russia after the war . . . a full-dress interdepartment meeting on the German question in general, and reparations in particular, was held on 3rd May in Morgenthau's office. . . . The first skirmish was over the powers of the Allied Control Council, which had been created on paper at Yalta, and in the dismantling and removal of German plants. Clayton (State) and Lovett (War) argued that a majority vote should decide all questions before the Council; the Treasury, with White speaking, insisted that such votes be unanimous, thereby leaving each ally the power of veto to prevent the removal of German industrial equipment from its particular zone. . . . The representative of State and War, on the other hand, feared that the Russian member of the Allied Control Council would prove obstreperous (p. 68). . . . Lovett wanted to be certain that the removal of industrial equipment from any of the occupied zones would not result in its eventual replacement by American tax dollars. 'Under no circumstances', he said caustically, 'should the US agree to any policy which would result in reparations being paid for by the US'.

"An even warmer dispute developed over the question of compulsory German labour as restitution for war damage in Russia. Treasury officials were boldly advocating the creation of a large labour force with no external controls, but the others vigorously disagreed with the idea of a 'slave labour force'.

"At this point Morgenthau threw the weight of his Cabinet rank into the discussion. The whole issue of compulsory labour had already been decided upon at Yalta, he announced, and somebody in the State Department 'ought to show' Crowley (of FEA) what the Yalta Agreement provided. It was no longer a question of 'whether there should or should not be slave labour'; it had been settled in the affirmative. 'We are simply carrying out the Yalta Agreement,' he exclaimed, 'and if Mr. Crowley is going to protest . . . he is protesting against Yalta . . .' (p. 69).

"Clayton was profoundly disturbed. He failed to see, he said, that the Yalta Agreement was clear as to whether the Allied armies of occupation were required to 'recruit' labourers in their zones and deliver them 'forcibly' to the Russians. To this Harold Glasser replied blandly: 'It's implied'. DuBois then reiterated what Lubin had said about the Gallup Poll showing a large per cent of Americans in favour of having 'three or four millions of Germans rebuild Russia'. But Clayton, like Lovett, was adamant in his insistence that there must be 'an international supervisory

service of some sort' to oversee the use of compulsory labour. . . . To this suggestion Treasury officials were unanimously opposed. . . . In the crucial meeting of 3rd May even more perhaps than ever before, Morgenthau's men were primed, confident, and hungry for revenge on Nazi Germany. Here we see the wolfpack of the Treasury in full cry.

"The Diaries reveal how Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, later the chief US prosecutor at Nuremberg war crimes trials, voiced a strong legalistic objection when he learned of the Treasury blueprint for compulsory labour. Jackson did not think that any person, not even a Nazi stormtrooper, ought to be sentenced to a slave camp without first having been adjudged by some court to be guilty. . . . Jackson held that no sentence could be passed without trial, but the (reparations) directive did not provide for any trial. Nor should prejudgement of these organizations be made before a trial had determined their conspiratorial character. 'I think', Jackson said, 'the plan to impress great numbers of labourers into foreign service, which means herding them into concentration camps, will largely destroy the moral position of the United States in this war. . . . In a year or two there will come drifting out of Russia tales of oppressive treatment of this labour, which I fear will be all too well-founded (p. 70). . . . What the world needs is not to turn one crowd out of concentration camps and put another crowd in, but to end the concentration camp idea'. Treasury officials were appalled by such reasoning.

"Important as such policy decisions were, equally important were the people who would interpret and enforce the policy directives. It was vital that the Treasury should have one of its most dependable men on the team of General Lucius Clay, who would soon begin his assignment as American High Commissioner in Germany. On 4th April 1945 General Clay had asked Morgenthau to designate a Treasury official to take full charge of the collapsing finances of the prostrate enemy. White immediately nominated his old friend Bernstein (p. 71). . . . For some reason Bernstein did not receive the appointment and five weeks later White suggested either Dr. Abraham G. Silverman or Lauchlin Currie for the crucial post both of whom were subsequently identified by Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers as belonging to a Communist cell in Washington.

"The death of Roosevelt in April 1945 brought into the White House an executive who would quickly prove unsympathetic to the Treasury plan for postwar Germany. Morgenthau, however,

seems to have been blissfully oblivious to the trouble ahead. . . . He and his staff were ready to extend Treasury influence as far and as deep as possible (p. 72).

"Fundamental changes in the management of American foreign policy occurred after Truman became President, but these were not clearly discernible at the time. For one thing, Truman saw to it that the State Department soon was reasserting its proper influence in the determination of foreign policy. As the influence of the Treasury diminished after the death of Roosevelt, a new orientation gradually developed which was marked by a step-by-step retreat from the principles of the Morgenthau Plan.

"On 5th July 1945, the day before President Truman left for Potsdam, it was announced in Washington that Henry Morgenthau had resigned after eleven years as Secretary of the Treasury. When Robert Murphy asked the President's naval aide, Admiral Leahy, whether this sudden resignation had any special significance, the Admiral replied: 'It's very significant. Morgenthau wanted to come to Potsdam and threatened to resign if he was not made a member of our delegation. Truman promptly accepted his resignation. While the President was still a Senator, he read in the newspapers about the Morgenthau Plan and he didn't like it. He also felt that the Treasury was exceeding its authority in presuming to make foreign policy. The President told us emphatically that the Treasury proposals for the treatment of Germany are out.'

(H. S. Truman: *Year of Decision*, p. 32)

"This did not, however, prove to be quite the case. In the long process of drafting and revising the directive to General Eisenhower . . . the spirit and indeed sometimes the letter of the Morgenthau Plan was reflected in the many mandatory provisions of the top secret directive JCS 1067. . . . Moreover, Colonel Bernstein and others derisively known as 'Morgenthau boys' clung to their posts long after their chief had resigned. . . . By the end of the year 1945 there were no less than 140 Treasury specialists in important positions in the military government in Germany. The weight of their considerable influence was thrown into the scales to shift American policy in the direction which Morgenthau had charted. As the popular columnist of the *New York Times*, Drew Middleton, put it, the Treasury corps served as a 'counterweight against those officials who, because of fear of the Soviet Union or other reasons, wanted to rebuild Germany'.

(D. Middleton: *The Struggle for Germany*, p. 47) (p. 73)

"Treatment of Germany in the 'initial control' period was the main topic discussed at the Potsdam Conference in July 1945. Allied leaders concurred in a programme which, whatever else might be said of it, mirrored the harshness of JCS 1067 and reflected the spirit of the Morgenthau Plan, particularly the idea of pastoralization. Not only were the Big Three unanimous in their conviction that German militarism and Nazism must be eradicated; they agreed also that Germany's industrial capacity was to be reduced, and the lesson of defeat brought home to every German. The Potsdam Agreement did, however, contain a clause which authorized each of the four zone commanders—American, British, French and Russian—to take any action 'essential to prevent starvation, disease, or civil unrest' in his sector. . . .

"Hardly more than a year later the Potsdam Agreement had become a subject of intense criticism. Early in September 1946, Lord Beveridge, after a visit to the British Zone of Occupation, said in a radio speech :

"'In the black moment of anger and confusion at Potsdam in July 1945, we abandoned the Atlantic Charter of 1941, which had named as our goals for all nations improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security; for all States, victor or vanquished, access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity. . . . The action of the Allies for the past 15 months in Germany made the Atlantic Charter hypocrisy' (F. A. Hermans: *Potsdam or Peace*, p. 7.) Hector McNeil, Under Secretary in the British Foreign Office, was just as critical. 'To keep the German people permanently in chains', he observed, 'means to keep ourselves permanently in rags' (ibid., pp. 11-12).

"What were the final results of the Morgenthau Plan? What actual effect did it have on Germany? 'While the policy was never fully adopted', wrote W. Friedmann, 'it had a considerable influence upon American policy in the later stages of the war and during the first phase of military government. Exponents of the Morgenthau policy occupied powerful positions in military government until radical changes of American policy under Secretary Byrnes. Remnants of this policy . . . created confusion and despair among Germans.' (W. Friedmann: *The Allied Military Government of Germany*, p. 20.) This programme, largely the work of Harry Dexter White, was unquestionably the most vindictive design for a defeated enemy ever to be recommended by the US Government" (p. 75).

There is one outstanding example in which the Morgenthau and Yalta recommendations were faithfully fulfilled. The Allies had agreed to release to the Russians all nationals who were Soviet citizens, in other words, all the anti-communist Russians who had taken refuge in the English, American and French zones in central Europe, as well as all the refugees from satellite countries such as Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and others. This clause was the occasion of innumerable scenes which lasted for years. At one point Soviet or ex-Soviet nationals were pursued by NKVD agents in the heart of Paris.

The French quickly realized that Russians handed over in this way would either be deported or shot, and so they took steps to see that as few as possible met this fate. The English took longer to realize the situation, but suddenly stopped handing them over. The Americans went on for a long time, and only ceased after the most atrocious tragedies had taken place, by which time their relations with the Soviets had stretched to breaking point.

"Although President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill eventually recognized the folly of what they had approved at Quebec, Morgenthau, White and the Treasury staff saw to it that the spirit and substance of their plan prevailed in official policy as it was finally mirrored in the punitive directive.

"In a very definite way JCS 1067 determined the main lines of US policy in Germany for fully two years after the surrender. Beginning in the autumn of 1945, to be sure, a new drift in American policy was evident, and it eventually led to the formal repudiation of the directive in July 1947. Until it was officially revoked, however, the lower administrative echelons had to enforce its harsh provisions. Since the instructions of JCS 1067 were virtual commands, American administrators had no choice but to interpret its provisions rigidly and apply them zealously (p. 75).

"As they got around to de-nazifying one enterprise after another, they had to dismiss thousands of efficient Germans whose records placed them in categories which JCS 1067 had marked for automatic exclusion from skilled employment. A classic case was the futile attempt of the American military government to operate the railroads with untrained German personnel under the direction of the few skilled Americans available. This unhappy experiment lasted several months. It did not make US officials any happier when it was learned that many of the discharged workers immediately found jobs in the British, French or Russian zones. The British, the French and the Russians imposed no dictums in

their zones comparable to JCS 1067. Their administrators, as well as many influential European journalists, viewed the American policy as utter lunacy.

"During the first two years of Allied occupation, the Treasury programme of industrial dismantlement was vigorously pursued by American officials. Industrial production was to be 'scaled down to approximately 70 to 75 per cent of 1936 levels'. . . . It was not long, however, before American officials realized that the programme implied the impossible: an economically strong Europe with a weak Germany.

"Industrial dismantlement, as it proved, worked at cross purposes with the cherished Treasury objective of pastoralizing Germany. Producers of agricultural machinery were unable to obtain legally (p. 76) the amounts of coal and iron necessary for continuous operations, and as a result many essential implements were simply not available to farmers. . . . All males between the ages of 14 and 65, and all females between 16 and 45, had to register for legal employment as a prerequisite for a food ration card. To escape the pangs of hunger, the unemployed urban population took to scouring the countryside for food and bartering away their remaining household goods. A medieval barter economy between town and country thus came into being and it did little to encourage agricultural activity.

"As White had certainly anticipated, the economic condition of Germany was desperate between 1945 and 1948. The cities remained heaps of debris, and shelter was at a premium as a relentless stream of unskilled refugees poured into the Western zones where the food ration of 1,500 calories per day was hardly sufficient to sustain life. Uncertainty regarding the future value of the Reichmark eliminated it as effective currency, and expectation of currency reform gave rise to widespread hoarding of goods. The repercussions were immediate. As Stimson, Riddleberger and others had predicted, the economic prostration of Germany now resulted in disruption of the continental trade that was essential to the prosperity of other European nations. . . . To nurse Europe back to health, the Marshall Plan was devised in 1947. It repudiated, at long last, the philosophy of the White-Morgenthau programme. The currency reforms of June 1948 changed the situation overnight. These long overdue measures removed the worst restraints, and thereupon West Germany began its phenomenal economic revival. . . .

"The Treasury plan for Germany aimed at quarantining the entire population of the defeated nation, and reducing its people

to abject misery. It was the absolute negation of every principle the United States held dear, and for which it had gone twice to war in one generation. Had it been carried out in its original form, it surely would have constituted the greatest act of genocide in modern history. The totalitarianism and barbarism of the Nazis were certainly enough to convince even the most charitable of Americans that only a tightly restrictive programme would effectively eliminate Germany as a threat to peace in the future (p. 77).

"After all this has been said, an implicit question haunts the historian. It is this: if the Morgenthau Plan was indeed psychopathically anti-German, was it also consciously and purposefully pro-Russian? To date, historical scholars have failed to answer, or even to ask, this vital question in their otherwise comprehensive studies of American diplomacy during and immediately following World War II. Yet this is a question of such profound historical importance that some day it must be answered definitively. The Secretary of the Treasury never denied that his plan was anti-German in both its philosophy and its projected effects, but no one in his department ever admitted that it was also pro-Russian in the same ways. In his book *And Call It Peace*, Marshall Knapen suggested in 1947 that the Morgenthau Plan 'corresponded closely to what might be presumed to be the Russian wishes on the German question' (pp. 53-56). . . . Can it be said finally that the Morgenthau Plan was Soviet-inspired? The Morgenthau Diaries alone do not yield enough incontrovertible evidence to permit an absolute pronouncement, but some of the documents published for the first time in this volume certainly point to an answer in the affirmative (p. 78).

"That Harry Dexter White was the actual architect, as well as the master builder, of the Morgenthau Plan can no longer be seriously disputed. In document after document the Diaries reveal White's abiding influence upon both the formative thinking and the final decisions of Secretary Morgenthau. Innocent of higher economics and the mysteries of international finance, the Secretary had always leaned heavily on his team of experts for all manner of general and specific recommendations. White was the captain of that team, and on the German question he called all the plays from the start. As a result of White's advice, for example, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing was ordered, in April 1944, to deliver to the Soviet Government a duplicate set of plates for the printing of the military occupation marks which were to be the legal currency of postwar Germany. The ultimate product of

this fantastic decision was to greatly stimulate inflation throughout occupied Germany; and the burden of redeeming these Soviet-made marks finally fell upon American taxpayers to a grand total of more than a quarter of a billion dollars (see *Transfer of Occupation Currency Plates—Espionage Phase*, Interim Report of the Committee on Government Operations, Government Printing Office, December 1953).

"A disturbing question remains: Who or what inspired or guided the brain and hand of White? The striking similarities in both concept and detail between the Treasury plan and Soviet designs for postwar Germany may, of course, have been merely coincidental. . . . The Diaries of course do not tell the story of machinations behind the scenes on the part of White and his colleagues (p. 79).

"If in fact White was himself an active agent of Soviet espionage, as J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI has charged, the implications are profound. There can be no denial of the fact that White had wide contacts with individuals, inside and outside the government, who had in common their admiration of Marxian philosophy. Nor can it be denied that White had direct access to much of the top-secret data of the American Government. He had persuaded Morgenthau to exchange information with other departments, and by the spring of 1945 at least seven agencies were trading their confidential papers with the Secretary of the Treasury. Many of these papers inevitably crossed White's desk.

"The concentration of Communist sympathizers in the Treasury Department, and particularly the Division of Monetary Research, is now a matter of record. White was the first director of that division; those who succeeded him in the directorship were Frank Coe and Harold Glasser. Also attached to the Division of Monetary Research were William Ludwig Ullmann, Irving Kaplan, and Victor Perlo. White, Coe, Glasser, Kaplan and Perlo were all identified in sworn testimony as participants in the Communist conspiracy. . . . In his one appearance before the House Committee in 1948, White emphatically denied participation in any conspiracy. A few days later he was found dead, the apparent victim of suicide by sleeping pills (p. 80).

"Never before in American history had an unelected bureaucracy of furtive, faceless, fourth floor officials exercised such arbitrary power or cast so ominous a shadow over the future of the nation as did Harry Dexter White and his associates in the Department of the Treasury under Henry Morgenthau Jr. What they attempted to do in their curious twisting of American ideals,

and how close they came to complete success, is demonstrated in these documents. But that is all which is known for sure. What priceless American secrets were conveyed to Moscow through the tunnels of the Communist underground will probably never be known—and how much actual damage these sinister men did to the security of the United States remains, at least for the moment, a matter of surmise" (p. 81).

At a crucial period in history, the fact is that a group of Jews in political circles succeeded in secretly orientating the foreign policy of the United States and thereby played a role of the utmost importance in determining the turn of events in Europe. In other words, as a result of their activities, the whole strength of the United States at the height of the war was placed at the service of Israel's revolutionary interests and ideology.

There were two facets to this policy, which was worked out between Morgenthau and Roosevelt. In the first place, it was a policy of implacable Jewish vengeance directed against not only the German Government but against the whole German people who were held collectively responsible for the crimes and errors of Hitler. And it was a policy of revolution which favoured the Soviet Government with a view to implanting Marxism throughout Europe.

On many occasions throughout history the Jews have been accused of constituting an alien minority which cannot be assimilated, a State within a State in the heart of the nations. The Morgenthau documents reveal that this is precisely the case and they prove, with the most striking evidence, that this charge is well founded.

On many an occasion in the course of the last half century Jews in finance and revolutionary Jews—the gold international and the blood international—have been accused of working secretly together in pursuit of a common Jewish ideal to conquer the world by means of disintegrating western Christian societies. Pro-Jewish liberals have poured scorn on this fear. But it is a fact that throughout the Morgenthau documents we learn how Jewish barons of high finance, such as Morgenthau, Harry Dexter White and Bernard Baruch, used their positions to put the whole resources of America at the disposal of Soviet Russia's interests in central Europe.

But there is even more to it than this. For it is apparent from the Morgenthau documents that for the whole of the duration of the war, the United States Treasury was a secret hot-bed of treason, spying and subversion operating within the very heart of the American Government, since the majority of the men who headed Morgenthau's team, such as Harry Dexter White, Harold Glasser,

Frank Coe, William Ludwig Ullmann, Abraham George Silverman, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, Lauchlin Currie, Salomon Adler and others, were finally unmasked as secret agents working for a Soviet spy network.

White committed suicide on 16th August 1948 rather than appear before the House Committee, but after his death a dramatic confrontation about his activities took place on American television (see Chap. VIII) between President Truman and Attorney General Brownell.

As my *Judaism and the Vatican* explains in detail, during the whole of the Second Vatican Council the Jews furiously protested against the deicide accusation and against the principle of collective responsibility which this accusation entails against the Jewish people. But the Morgenthau documents clearly demonstrate that the Jews themselves applied this principle of collective guilt to Germany and pursued a policy of implacable vengeance against the whole German people whom they held responsible for Hitler's crimes and errors.

In other words, they furiously reject the principle of collective responsibility when it impugns them, but they demand its application with equal severity when they stand to become its principal beneficiaries. They won the sympathy of the civilized world for the sufferings inflicted on them by Hitler's savagely repressive measures; but thereafter they use the argument of their six million dead in order to forbid categorically any discussion of the Jewish problem. Since Nuremberg, indeed, the very word Jew has become taboo, and it can only be mentioned in the press at the risk of being described as a pogromist oneself.

As Suslov, one of the leaders of the central committee of the Communist Party in Russia, stated recently: "If you but touch so much as a single hair of any Jew anywhere in the world, all the others raise a clamour from the four corners of the globe". Just one phrase in a speech by General de Gaulle, on the occasion of the Arab-Israeli war: "The Jews, an élite people, sure of themselves and domineering"—raised a tempest of protest which was perhaps not unconnected with his fall.

Israel claims to have suffered a genocide unparalleled in history. It is true that Hitler treated the Jews without any consideration, and we are all the more ready to recognize that fact since not even the most ferocious anti-semitic in France has ever suggested that the solution to the Jewish question lies in massacre and genocide. But having said this, it is nevertheless helpful to recall certain essential truths.

First of all, as regards the number of victims, six million Jews are

said to have perished in the concentration camps of Auschwitz, Sobibor, Maidanek, and Treblinka, etc., all of which were situated in Poland and exclusively reserved for Jews. Six million dead, we are told, is sufficient to explain, to excuse and to justify everything.

But this figure of six million was asserted in the general hysteria which followed the Liberation at the end of the war without the slightest shadow of proof or justification. It has been widely diffused throughout the world, but today it is more and more contested, and it can be said to be akin to the famous seventy-five thousand members of the French Communist Party who were shot dead. No serious, impartial or documented study has ever been conducted on this subject, but a former inmate of Buchenwald, who was moreover a socialist, Paul Rassinier, began very far-reaching and serious research on the subject in a series of books published under the following titles: *Le mensonge d'Ulysse*, *Ulysse trahi par les siens*, *le véritable procès Eichmann* and *Le drame des Juifs européens* (see my *Judaism and the Vatican*, Appendix II).

He reached the conclusion that the figure of Jewish victims in the death camps hovers around the one million two hundred thousand mark, and that this figure has been more or less tacitly accepted by certain Jewish organizations such as the World Centre for Contemporary Jewish Documentation at Tel Aviv. That's a great number, and a great deal too many, especially as most of them were of little or no importance in world Jewry, but after all, Jews were not the only people to fall victim to Hitler, far from it. Hitler was responsible for the deaths of more Christians than Jews. His pitiless regime spared no one. There is the question of the treatment of the Russian prisoners, the burnt earth policy in Russia and many other brutal acts to take into consideration. The Germans themselves were among the first to fall to the regime, and quite a number of the high-up Wehrmacht leaders, soldiers covered with glory, were executed by Hitler, often with extreme savagery: General von Schleicher, Marshals Rommel, von Witzleben and von Kluge, Admiral Canaris, and some others. Their names are scarcely ever mentioned. Only Jewish victims have the power to move the universal conscience.

And then is it not true that western Jews, and those of America especially, themselves added fuel to the flames which fell on their European brothers? It is sufficient to mention the Kaufman book, to which we will refer further on, the Morgenthau documents, and the declarations of Harry Dexter White and Bernard Baruch and others, all of whom were highly influential in the conduct of the war.

The Morgenthau documents, for example, if I may remind you, were not the product of the Goebbels propaganda office, but carry an official authenticity since they were published by the Government of the United States, which may be regarded as a prototype of modern, liberal, enlightened and democratic administrations. Morgenthau and his team insistently demanded the integral application of their plan for Germany, which clearly advocated the total and definite destruction of all German industry, beginning with the Ruhr, Germany having to content herself with becoming an exclusively pastoral and agricultural country in the future.

The most immediate and obvious result of this extravagant plan would have been the deaths of thirty million inhabitants from starvation in Western Germany alone. This is precisely what the American War Minister, Stimson, promptly remarked as soon as he heard about this mad scheme, to which Roosevelt and Churchill had given their assent at Quebec. Morgenthau and his assistants were completely indifferent to this possibility. If they were pushed to the limits, Morgenthau was prepared to concede that the excess Germans should be deported to Africa.

The Morgenthau Plan also advocated three essential measures:

1. The Allies were to draw up a complete list of German war criminals who were to be arrested and shot on sight without trial.
2. Several million Germans, chosen from Nazi Party members, officers of the Wehrmacht and all those who had directly or indirectly collaborated with the regime, were to be handed over to the Russians for unconditional use as forced labour in the reconstruction of devastated areas.
3. All refugees who had fled from Soviet Russia before and during the war, would be handed over to the Russians, who would obviously either shoot them or else deport them to concentration camps in Siberia.

Morgenthau had a long and violent controversy with the Ministers of War and the State Department, who were opposed to this plan, but as long as Roosevelt was alive, he could be sure of his support and prevailed against them in securing most of his points, as the reader can see for himself by studying the résumé of the Morgenthau documents which we have published in this chapter.

The particular interest of the Morgenthau documents lies in the eminent personality of the Minister himself and the importance of the posts he held, as well as in the fact that they are official publications of the American Government. But there are other

Jewish personalities and documents which confirm and strengthen them.

As the personal friend of Roosevelt, and as the political adviser to successive Presidents of the American Republic, Baruch held a position in the Government of the United States which even surpassed that of Morgenthau in importance and influence. However, again according to the above-quoted documents, Baruch considered that the Morgenthau Plan was much too soft. All that he had got to live for, he said, was to see that Germany was de-industrialized, and turning towards the Minister of War, he added that he would not let anyone get in his way.

Both Baruch and the Morgenthau team were careful not to compromise post-war relations with the Soviet Union, and they frequently expressed their fear at seeing Russia becoming encircled by the West.

We have spent a long time on the Morgenthau documents, but they are not the only ones of their kind, and there are any number of other Jewish documents which confirm them.

From among the latter we have selected two which are more or less akin to the Morgenthau Plan: Theodore N. Kaufman's *Germany Must Perish*, which was published in 1941 in the United States by the Argyle Press, and Michael Bar-Zohar's *Les Vengeurs*, which was published by Fayard of Paris in 1968.

Kaufman's book sets out a plan which was to be applied to Germany after her defeat in order to prevent any possibility of a new war of aggression arising in the future. Kaufman advocates the total destruction of the German population by a very simple means: the massive sterilization of all men and women of German nationality between the age of puberty and 60 years.

When I first heard about this book it seemed to me such an extravagant story that I doubted its authenticity, but I finally got hold of a copy from the United States, and it is an unquestionably authentic work from which Rassinier quoted faithfully. Here are several passages from the book in question:

"Today's war is not a war against Adolf Hitler, nor is it a war against the Nazis . . . it is a struggle between the German nation and humanity (p. 1). Hitler is no more to be blamed for this German war than was the Kaiser for the last one. Nor Bismarck before the Kaiser. These men did not originate or wage Germany's wars against the world. They were merely the mirrors reflecting centuries-old inbred lust of the German nation for conquest and mass murder.

"This war is being waged by the German people. It is they who are responsible. It is they who must be made to pay for the war. Otherwise, there will always be a German war against the world (p. 2).

"This time Germany has forced a total war upon the world. As a result, she must be prepared to pay a total penalty. And there is one, and only one, such total penalty: Germany must perish forever. In fact—not in fancy (p. 3).

"There remains then but one mode of ridding the world forever of Germanism—and that is to stem the source from which issue those war-lusted souls, by preventing the people of Germany from ever again reproducing their kind. This modern method, known to science as Eugenic Sterilization, is at once practical, humane and thorough (p. 93).

"The population of Germany, excluding conquered and annexed territories, is about seventy million, almost equally divided between male and female. To achieve the purpose of German extinction (p. 94), it would only be necessary to sterilize some forty-eight million, a figure which excludes, because of their limited power to procreate, males over 60 years of age, and females over 45.

"Concerning the males subject to sterilization, the army groups, as organized units, would be the easiest and quickest to deal with. Taking twenty thousand surgeons as an arbitrary number, and on the assumption that each will perform a minimum of 25 operations daily, it would take no more than one month, at the maximum, to complete their sterilization. . . . The balance of the male civilian population of Germany could be treated within three months. Inasmuch as sterilization of women needs somewhat more time, it may be computed that the entire female population of Germany could be sterilized within a period of three years or less. Complete sterilization of both sexes, and not only one, is to be considered necessary in view of the present German doctrine that so much as one drop of true German blood constitutes a German (pp. 94, 95).

"The consequent gradual disappearance of the Germans from Europe will leave no more negative effect upon that continent than did the gradual disappearance of the Indians upon this" (p. 96).

This book is some years old, and its author is relatively unknown. Why then have we chosen to reproduce it here?

We have selected some of its passages for inclusion here because of the baneful influence the book had upon the conduct of the war. Goebbels, who had a diabolical genius for propaganda, got hold of a

copy, just as he got hold of a copy of the Morgenthau Plan and the proclamation of Casablanca, in which the Allies announced to the whole world that they would demand the unconditional and global surrender of Germany, that is to say, a capitulation which would fling open the gates of Europe before Russia.

Here again I quote from the Morgenthau documents as published by the American Government :

"Hitler's chief of propaganda, Dr. Goebbels, made good use of the Morgenthau Plan as a rallying cry to the German people to put up a last-ditch resistance. This they did for seven months more—while American bombers flattened and burned dozens of German cities and hundreds of industrial plants which American taxpayers would one day be called upon to help rebuild in order to correct the imbalance in Europe which, by a monumental miscalculation, their victory had achieved."

(*Morgenthau Diary*, p. 43)

It is very important to notice that Kaufman's book was published in the United States in 1941, at a time when the Jews had not yet been assembled in the death camps. It is permissible to suppose that Hitler was inspired by it when he took the decision to do away with the Jews who were in his control and who served as hostages to him in some way or other. Thus he used against them the very measures of annihilation which Kaufman and then Morgenthau and Baruch advocated against the German people.

It is almost certain that at the beginning Hitler did not intend to proceed to massacre the Jews; he wanted them out of Germany and Europe, and with this intention he began to herd them into camps with a view to transporting them when circumstances would permit.

But the war took a bad turn for Germany. Thereupon, the American Jews, Kaufman, Morgenthau and Baruch, bellowed for death and for the destruction of Germany. Thus, whether rightly or wrongly is of little importance—I am seeking to explain, not to justify—Hitler considered that he was in a legitimate state of defence. It is under these conditions that the fatal decision was taken which was to find its epilogue in Auschwitz and other camps.

Convinced by Kaufman's book, by the Morgenthau documents and by the Casablanca Conference that the defeat of Germany would herald the destruction of the country, the whole German people fought to the last with a desperate energy. As a result, the war was prolonged for one further, perfectly useless year, except that hundreds of thousands more died, and appalling destruction took place, and above all, this delay enabled communist Russia to pene-

trate to the heart of Europe where she is still solidly entrenched, constituting a permanent and much more serious menace to western civilization than ever did Hitler.

Long before May 1945 the Wehrmacht leaders knew that Germany had lost the war and they desperately sought to capitulate on the western front in order to protect their eastern flank from the Russians, but they were up against the demented Hitler, and the intransigent Roosevelt and Morgenthau, who were desirous at all costs of protecting the interests of their dear friends the Russians. It is in this tragic situation that the attempt against Hitler took place in July 1944.

We have just spoken of the Kaufman book, but as our readers will not be able to buy it, let us proceed at once to *Les Vengeurs* by Michael Bar-Zohar, which is readily available in all the bookshops.

Who is Michael Bar-Zohar? I have no idea. His publishers—the old and honourable house of Fayard—have this to say about him on the dust-jacket:

“Mr. Bar-Zohar was born in 1938 at Sofia in Bulgaria. He completed a brilliant course of studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and then at Paris. He is a Doctor of political science, he has an international reputation, and he has been translated and published by some of the best known firms in the United States, Germany, England, and other countries.

“Before he wrote *Les Vengeurs*, Michael Bar-Zohar travelled over the whole world, interrogating secret agents, justiciaries and judges, and examining numerous documents. . . .”

In this book, “for the first time we are presented not with the tale of the pursuit of such and such a Nazi criminal, but with a complete picture of this campaign of Jewish vengeance”.

After the Allied victory and the occupation of Germany, certain Jewish groups penetrated the country, especially in the English and American zones: small Jewish military units, which had been formed within the Anglo-Saxon armies, and which consisted of interpreters, members of the Anglo-American information service, and various other ranks. This book describes their behaviour in Germany, and is obsessed with a phrase which constantly recurs throughout the work like a refrain: Jewish vengeance. We shall quote several examples of this theme from the work.

A small Jewish brigade, which had been formed into an autonomous unit within the British Army, was stationed at Brinsighella near Bologna in Italy.

"Suddenly a rumour runs through the ranks like gunpowder : we are going to be sent into Germany as part of the occupation forces. These men, these Palestinian volunteers, know that the British authorities hesitated a long time before letting them into contact with German soldiers or civilians. There was indeed reason to fear that the desire for vengeance in the Jewish soldiers was stronger than their sense of discipline. 'We are going to Germany. . . .' The men discuss the news excitedly : 'It's too good to be true.'

"We only want one month there, they said, but one month, and after that 'they' will never forget us. This time they really will have a reason for hating us. There will be just one pogrom, in round figures, a thousand houses fired, five hundred dead, a hundred women violated. . . .' And the boys were heard to say : 'I must kill a German, in cold blood, I ought to. I must have a German woman. . . . Afterwards I couldn't care less. . . . Why should we alone, we Jews, suffer Auschwitz and the Warsaw ghetto and keep all this horror in the memory of our people? The Germans, too, must be given a name to recall, that of a town which we have destroyed and blotted off the face of the earth. Our object in this war is vengeance, and not Roosevelt's four liberties or the glory of the British Empire or Stalin's ideas. Vengeance, Jewish vengeance. . . .'

"The day before departing for Germany, the call to arms took place in the Palestinian regiments. Facing the flag, a corporal read out the 'Commandments of a Hebrew soldier on German land' :

Remember that the fighting Jewish brigade is a Jewish occupation force in Germany;

Remember that our appearance as a brigade, with our emblem and our flag, among the German people, is in itself a vengeance;

Carry yourself as a Jew proud of his people and of his flag;

Do not besmirch your honour with them and do not mix with them;

Do not listen to them and do not go into their houses;

May they be spurned, them and their wives and their children and their goods and everything which is theirs, spurned forever;

Remember that your mission is the salvation of the Jews, immigration to Israel and the liberation of our country;

Your duty is: devotion, fidelity and love towards the survivors of death, the survivors of the camps.

"Stock still in an impeccable position of attention, all their muscles hardened, the soldiers of the Jewish brigade listen in

silence. Their impassive mien conceals feelings of hatred, mixed with an immense joy."

The Israeli writer Hanoch Bartov, who was at that time a young combatant in the brigade, later wrote :

"The blood was beating in our veins. To see our battalions drawn up under arms, and our lorries and combat vehicles ready for departure, with our flag unfurled, and to hear these words being addressed to us, all that made quite a scene. We would avenge our people, without any pleasure, without feeling any taste for the task we had to do, but we would avenge them. For all eternity we would become the implacable enemies of those who were torturing our people. And each one of us thought: 'Tomorrow, tomorrow I will be in Germany. . . .'

"The British commander decided at the last moment, in order to avoid any possibility of an incident, that the Jewish brigade would remain in Italy . . . with death in their souls, the Hebrew soldiers obeyed. The prospect of vengeance became remote. They were forbidden to go to Germany.

"Not long after the Jewish brigade arrived at Tarvisio, disorders broke out in the town: Germans were attacked, houses belonging to nazis were set on fire, women were violated. The culprits were not discovered, but the brigade command, which was formed of Jewish officers affiliated to the Hagana, became anxious. Violent disturbances of this nature were harmful to the Jewish cause. They realized that the feeling for vengeance, which ran high in all the Jewish soldiers at Tarvisio, would have to be contained, and it was with this object in mind that the leaders of the Hagana decided to entrust the right of spilling blood in the name of the whole Jewish people simply to one small group of men who were particularly reliable and known for their moral qualities".

This is the story, as told to us by one of the avengers himself :

"Our mission in this town was to be vengeance. But first of all it was essential to know whom we were intended to strike. There would have to be no doubt as to the guilt of the victims. The Hagana avengers will kill, but they will only kill deliberately. This principle was to guide all their actions.

"Their first source of information for unearthing the guilty were the Allied information services, which held dossiers of well-known war criminals and lists of SS officers and nazis living in the region. English, American and even Palestinian Jews were working in these services. 'It was they', one of the former mem-

bers of the group, a man who is now a general, told me, 'who, unknown to their superiors, regularly supplied us with information'. But the dossiers and the lists were not always sufficient and they were not always available.

"By order of the Hagana, a second group of avengers was formed in the heart of the Jewish brigade. As a precaution, neither of the two commandos were aware of the existence of the other; only their leaders knew about them. Each group adopted almost identical methods. Lt.-Col. Marcel Tobias, who as a young volunteer belonged to the second group, had this to report to an Israeli journalist in 1964:

"The tarpaulin covered truck stopped at a pre-arranged place and on the pretext of holding a purely formal enquiry, we led out the SS officer. Behind were three soldiers of the military police who never breathed a word. When we reached a lake or a river, the SS was strangled, his body roped to a heavy stone, and he was thrown in the water. On the return journey, I left the truck two kilometres from the camp and came back on foot in order not to arouse suspicion.'

"In this way, almost every evening for months the avengers of the Jewish brigade travelled through the towns and villages of North Italy, Southern Austria and Southern Germany. They only rested when the Palestinian officers responsible for the commandos were on guard at the camp or assigned to a particular mission. Also, their punitive missions were sometimes suspended out of prudence, for rumours were beginning to circulate.

"We are not assassins. Believe me, it was not always easy.

"No, we were not afraid of danger, in fact, what we did was not dangerous. Nothing very serious could happen to us. Our deeds were not intended to serve as a warning for the future to those who might perhaps be tempted to recommence the horrors of nazism. No, these actions were secret, and they were intended to remain secret. People are not warned by the way in which we acted. Why should it not be admitted? Our action was purely and simply vengeance. Do you know the expression 'the very gentle flavour of vengeance'? That was how it felt to me, I assure you. The execution of a nazi whom I knew was either directly or indirectly responsible for snatching a baby from the arms of his mother, smashing its head against a wall, and then shooting the mother in front of the very eyes of her husband, yes, this punishment did have this very gentle and savoury taste of vengeance. I have killed. And I can tell you something else: if I had to do it again, I would. For there was a great moral justification for

our actions. Since then I have never felt any remorse, not once.

"How many nazis fell at the hands of the Jewish brigade? Estimates vary, and this is understandable since the majority of the avengers only knew of the operations in which they themselves took part. According to Gil'ad, the commando was operating almost every night for six months: thus it would have accomplished about 150 executions. To this figure should be added those nazis who were discovered among the pretended sick in the hospital at Tarvisio and put to death. Another avenger who may be believed told me: 'Between two and three hundred persons'.

"But it is not essentially the number of nazis which is interesting, for whatever it may have been, it can only have been a derisory figure in comparison with the extent of their crimes and the number of their victims. It is the feelings of these men, their state of mind and the driving force behind them, which I have attempted to understand and to reveal, and I was curious to know what they thought about it all today, twenty years later.

"I have interrogated several of these avengers at length. The first conclusion which I reached is that these men, without exception, felt, at that period, that they were invested with a historic, national mission. They felt that they were representing a whole people. They are all convinced today that they acted in accordance with their duty and their obligations. Their thirst for slaking their vengeance does not appear to have affected their honesty, their moral integrity or their equilibrium. Known or unknown, almost all of them hold important civil or military posts in Israel today. They are normal men."

Most of the German victims were former nazis, SS officers, and others, which explains and in part justifies these Jewish reprisal actions, but that was not always the case, far from it, since as Bar-Zohar tells us, when for example the members of a Jewish group saw a solitary German riding his bicycle while they were out in a car, they would quickly open the door of the car when they got to him, knock him off and drive over him.

Elsewhere Bar-Zohar tells us of the Nakam group, which was formed under the auspices of the Hagana in Germany:

"The staff of the Nakam group submitted three plans for study, A, B and C.

"The principal project, said Béni, was project B. It was question of striking a massive blow against SS officers and other nazis who

were assembled in the camps. We were afraid, not without reason, that they would soon be liberated, to return home unpunished. Once we had accomplished this undertaking, we would turn to plan C, which was to pursue and punish those notorious nazis whom we could track down.

"—And plan A, I asked him.

"Béni seemed a little uneasy, but eventually he told me:

"The staff of the Nakam group drew up a plan which was only communicated to a few. A great deal of time and money was spent on getting this plan into shape. This much we knew, that if it had succeeded, any other action would have been useless. Today, with the passage of time, it is permissible to describe this plan as diabolical. It involved the killing of millions of Germans; millions, I am telling you, in one go, without distinction between age or sex. The principal difficulty was that we only wanted to strike against Germans. However, the territory of the former Reich was covered with Allied soldiers and the nationals of every nation in Europe who had either been liberated from labour camps, or else had escaped from concentration camps. And then it was true that some of us had not got sufficient determination to carry out such a terrible act, even against the Germans. . . .

"As a result, we concentrated principally on plan B. After several months of research, we selected our site for action, a camp near Nuremberg—a town which had been one of the most important centres of nazism. There, thirty-six thousand SS officers had been gathered, and it was towards this camp that a little reconnaissance group made its way early in 1946 in order to carry out the first act of vengeance.

"We had decided, said Jacob, to poison the thirty-six thousand SS officers, and I was in charge of carrying out the plan.

"It did not take our agents long to find out that the camp was supplied with bread which was made by a big industrial bakery in Nuremberg which lay on the outskirts of the town near a railway line. Several thousand loaves of black and white bread were delivered to the camp every day.

"First of all we had to find out which loaves were for consumption by the prisoners, and which were destined for the Allied, American, British and Polish soldiers whose duty it was to guard the prisoners. One of our men was signed on at the bakery . . . with that knowledge, we advanced to the second stage of the plan. We took some samples of the bread and sent it to our experts.

"In their laboratories, the chemists experimented with several

poisons. It was essential that it should not act too quickly, for that would have aroused their suspicion when they saw their fellow SS struck down by the bread they had just eaten.

"The group had accomplices among American soldiers of Jewish confession who were guarding the camp. By April 1946 the preparations had been completed.

"We wanted to poison fourteen thousand loaves, which would have meant six hours' work for at least five men, and two other men were also needed to keep the mixture constantly stirred in the vessel, for the arsenic had a tendency to separate from the other ingredients.

"We decided to carry out the deed one Saturday night, for two reasons: on Sunday, the bakery was shut, and the delay between the preparation of the bread and its transportation to the camp was prolonged for twenty-four hours. We chose the night of the 13th to 14th April 1946, but that night there was an extremely violent storm, the German guards and the American police remained on the alert all night, and the avengers were forced to flee in the middle of the night, although they succeeded in disguising their tracks.

"Thus operation poison loaf was a failure, but not quite, however, for the avengers had had time to make up more than two thousand loaves, and on Monday, 15th April 1946 these were taken to the camp with the ordinary loaves and distributed to the prisoners at the rate of one between five or six men. During the day, several thousand SS were violently sick, and according to the rumours which were circulated in some newspapers, twelve thousand Germans suffered as a result of eating the arsenic bread, and several thousand had died.

"These figures are exaggerated. According to the avengers, four thousand three hundred prisoners suffered from the poisoning, and about one thousand were urgently transported into the American hospitals. In the days following the incident, between seven and eight hundred prisoners died, and others, who were struck with paralysis, died in the course of the year.

"The avengers claim a total of about a thousand deaths. The American police were not long in uncovering the web. The bread led them to the factory, where they discovered the vessel containing the mixture, and all the equipment. But when it came to identifying the guilty party, their researches ended in an impasse. Terrified that the news might leak out to other prisoner of war camps, and to the civilian German population, the American commander did all he could to stifle the matter. Military censor-

ship went so far as forbidding the German press to publish information about the poisoning."

The members of the Nakam team who had taken part in this operation succeeded in fleeing abroad, and they found refuge in France.

"They didn't stay long in France, Italy or Czechoslovakia. Once the commotion which the affair had aroused had settled down, they went back again to Germany, to continue the vengeance.

"Throughout the year 1946, however, difficulties continued to arise. The Hagana leaders and other Jewish organizations became less and less enthusiastic about the plans of the avengers.

"We felt we were being abandoned, Moshe, the leader of the Nakam group in Europe, told me. We had carried out acts of vengeance in Belgium, Holland and France. The people we met there understood our feelings better than certain Jews, better even than our Palestinian brothers. We had heart-rending discussions with people whom we imagined ought to have been of assistance to us, not excluding the Hagana.

"Certain particularly spectacular projects were opposed by the Hagana.

"Towards the end of 1945, a very far-reaching plan had been laid for executing the twenty-one accused at the Nuremberg Trial, either by poisoning them, or by letting off a bomb in the court room, or by slaughtering them while the court was in session by means of an armed commando.

"All these plans were abandoned, said Jacob, but I can tell you one thing, they were not utopian, and our preparations were very far advanced. However, we did nothing because we did not want to injure innocent people.

"Instead of proceeding with the execution of the twenty-one accused at the Nuremberg Trial, the Nakam group came back to its original plan A—the extermination, by some means or other, of several million Germans. The Hagana was aware of the risks involved in such an operation, and knew that this sort of thing could show up the Jewish people in a very unfavourable light. Accordingly it attempted to exert its authority over the group of avengers, but did the Nakam group nevertheless try and proceed with carrying out this plan?"

Whatever happened, it was dissolved and the members of the group were taken back to Palestine.

"However, at the same period, a plan for massive reprisals against the German people was on the point of coming to fruition. It was the work of a group of avengers whose peculiarity was that the majority of their members were non-Jews.

"An Israeli journalist, S. Nakdimon, was the first to bring this group to light. Other sources, whom I am pledged not to reveal, have completed the picture for me.

"These men intended first of all to set fire to several German towns. Later they laid plans for poisoning the populations of Berlin, Munich—the cradle of nazism—Nuremberg, Hamburg and Frankfurt.

"Technically, the problem was not impossible. It was a question of introducing poison into the drinking water reservoirs. Here again the biggest difficulty was how to avoid injuring soldiers of the occupation forces and non-German refugees who were stationed in these five towns. It was decided to strike first at Nuremberg, where the nazis had insolently proclaimed their triumph.

"Men of our group, he told me, got themselves signed on as workmen or technicians in the companies controlling the distribution of the water. Once we had mastered the complete plan of the distribution system, we worked out a very complicated project which involved cutting off the water supplies, at zero hour, which fed the Allied occupied barracks and the areas in which most of the non-Germans were situated. These zones would have been spared, the rest of Nuremberg would have drawn poisoned water. In other words, no German ought to have survived, except the drunk. . . .

"It was not easy to get hold of the poison. A scientist from an important overseas country agreed to supply the avengers. The poison was hidden in the haversack of a soldier on leave who was returning to his unit. His mission was to hand over the haversack to a certain address in France. All was ready, but it was never carried out.

"Why not? On this point the accounts which I received do not agree.

"In describing various episodes of this strange and little known phenomenon of Jewish vengeance, I have made every effort to quote, with the minimum of comment, from the testimony which I have received. From the accounts, confidences and revelations which dozens of men have been good enough to confide to me there emerges a certain number of facts and ideas which express the peculiar and unique historical character of these reprisals.

"Let us take first of all the personalities involved. The striking thing is that all the avengers, whether from the Jewish brigade of

the Nakam group, the Deutsche Abteilung, the Documentation Centre at Vienna or other groups—they were all good, honest men. Their behaviour and conduct reveal a profound intellectual and moral honesty. They were just as severe on themselves as they were on the nazi executioners. The desire for justice and their care not to strike the innocent stands out in all their acts of vengeance. As we have seen, plans for acts of massive reprisal against the German people were never carried out.

“... and yet, when they did strike it was less to avenge a father or a brother than the whole Jewish people. Each of the avengers felt that he had been charged with a mission by all the survivors and by all the dead of the Jewish nation, a mission to punish. A mission to ensure that the men who had been responsible for massacring hundreds of defenceless men, women, old people and children, should not be allowed to return to their business in tranquillity after spending a few months in a prisoner of war camp or suffering a derisory prison sentence.

“They drowned, poisoned and shot hundreds of nazis, but they never robbed them, they never succumbed to an act of ‘recuperation’. They all knew that vengeance, a blood act, had to be carried out in an irreproachable manner.

“Paradoxically, it was the creation of the State of Israel more than anything else which resulted in a lessening of this Jewish vengeance. If this Hebrew State had not had to be born, and in so doing demanded all their energy and sacrifices, it is certain that a much greater number of nazi criminals would have been executed. As has been seen, there was sometimes very acute opposition between the Palestinian Jewish organizations and the avengers. This is because these men found it difficult to choose between what they regarded as two most sacred duties—vengeance, or the creation of the State of Israel.

“The Hagana was very definitely opposed to acts of massive reprisal against the German people, in order not to arouse international opinion against the Jews, whereas the avengers would have preferred their movement to have been officially sanctioned, first of all by the Jewish organizations and subsequently by the State of Israel, so that their vengeance could be carried on in broad daylight without the need for camouflage, and so that the world would have known who was striking, and why.”

(M. Bar-Zohar : *Les Vengeurs*, Paris, 1968, pp. 28–111)

These books, which are preoccupied with Jewish hatred and vengeance, leave us feeling profoundly uneasy. Besides, they clearly

demonstrate that the Jewish people and the Jewish nation constitute an entity which embraces all the Jews in the world, whether of Israel, the Diaspora or Palestine. With regard to the Jews of the Diaspora, we are once again confronted with the eternal problem of dual nationality.

Genocide, assassination in concentration camps, forced labour, the murder of prisoners of war—are not these the facts which stand out in the Morgenthau Plan, in Kaufman's book and in the behaviour of Jewish groups in occupied Germany as described by Michael Bar-Zohar?

Now, between 1934 and 1945 Morgenthau and his team inspired and directed American policy towards Germany, Europe and Russia. Is one therefore to conclude that throughout this crucial period in the history of the world the might of America was put at the service of a policy dictated by Jewish hatred and vengeance?

It is a question which may validly and legitimately be asked.

VII

THE KOREAN WAR, THE SORGE SPY RING AND THE MACARTHUR-WILLOUGHBY REPORT

During the Second World War, the leading adviser to the German Ambassador in Tokyo was a man named Richard Sorge, an outstanding specialist in Japanese and Chinese affairs.

A member of the Nazi party, and the Far East correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Sorge, who spoke both Japanese and Chinese, had a very deep knowledge of Asian problems. He had studied the art, the religions, the politics, the literature, the traditions, the history and the economy of the two great eastern countries, he had extensive connections and possessed very exact and complete information, and his political forecasts were always proved right in the event.

The various diplomats and attachés of the Germany Embassy (military, naval, air and Gestapo), who had little experience of the problems and mentality of the east, found themselves in a country to which they were theoretically allied but which left them cut off from their own country by thousands of miles of sea and the breadth of an immense continent of land in a state of war. Germany had concluded an agreement with Japan, but in fact each country pursued its own policy without showing too much concern for the interests of its partner. Providentially, therefore, Sorge was an absolutely indispensable man whose knowledge, experience and advice was sought after on every occasion when decisions were required at the highest political level on matters affecting the German-Japanese alliance and the conduct of the war.

Sorge was on terms of the closest friendship with a Japanese called Ozaki Hozumi, a writer who was equally well versed in affairs, and who held an important position as adviser to Prince Konoyé. The latter had been Prime Minister several times and led the Japanese-American negotiations which preceded Pearl Harbour. Ozaki Hozumi was justly recognized in Japan as a great expert on Chinese questions, and by the extent of his connections and the accuracy of his judgement he represented a Japanese counterpart to Sorge. The

Sorge-Hozumi combination constituted an incomparable information service.

In October 1941 the Japanese Government sent a secret note to the German Embassy in which they revealed an absolutely staggering piece of news: Richard Sorge and Hozumi had just been arrested by the Japanese police for their part in heading a Soviet spy network. Sixteen other members of the network had been arrested at the same time, including Germans, Jews, Yugoslavians and Japanese. The Ambassador nevertheless was convinced that it was a case of appalling misunderstanding, such as had happened before in Japan, and made immediate efforts to get Sorge released, but the Japanese police held to their charge, and claimed that they had unveiled a vast spy scandal. If this was indeed the case, it was an exceptionally serious matter, and the Ambassador, Ott, and the chief of the Gestapo, Meisinger, were playing not merely for their posts but for their lives.

However, the allegations were perfectly true, and the whole matter was infinitely worse than even the most pessimistic prediction. Sorge was a Soviet agent, and with Hozumi's assistance he had organized and controlled a spy network which covered the whole of the Far East, from Shanghai to Tokyo. For nine years he had carried on these operations without awakening the least suspicions, and during that time he had passed an incredible amount of information to the Russians. The police had been alerted when a secondary member of the group, a Japanese, had denounced their activities. They had followed up the clue, and finding that it was a question of the utmost gravity, they had uncovered the whole network and then struck rapidly at a given moment.

A very lengthy and detailed enquiry then took place, lasting for three years. Once they had been arrested, Sorge, Hozumi and most of the other members of the group spoke freely. Sorge took a sort of pride in recounting the history and organization of his network in the utmost detail, describing its incredible success and its immense service to Soviet Russia. Such a tale is probably unique in the annals of international spy history, and the following is a brief resume of his account.

Richard Sorge was born in Bakou in 1895, of a Russian mother and a German father. His father was a mining engineer in the Caucasus, and his grandfather, Adolphus Sorge, had been Karl Marx's secretary at the time the first International was founded. Three times wounded in the German army during the First World War, he became a fanatical Marxist following the Russian Revolution, and a militant member of the communist party of Hamburg,

where in 1920 he received a doctorate in political science. He had a natural gift for languages, and when he arrived in Japan he spoke English, French, Russian, Japanese and probably Chinese fluently. Physically, he was a very strong man, with sharp features and a violent and cruel character, given to debauchery and drink. However, he never betrayed himself among his German and Japanese drinking companions, who never knew that he also spoke Russian.

Meanwhile, Sorge became convinced that China and Japan were areas of vital importance for the future of Communism, and he set himself to study Asian problems.

In 1927 the Canton rising took place, and this event was to mark a turning point in the history of the Chinese revolution. The Kuo Ming Tan movement for the liberation of China, the successor to Sun Yat-Sen, led the struggle for the conquest of the country. Its army was commanded by the young general Tchang Kai-Chek, whose fortunes were beginning to rise. The left wing of the Kuo Ming Tan was formed by the young Chinese communist party, which was powerfully supported by Moscow under the direction of Borodin, who was in charge of political affairs, and Galen (General Blücher), who was responsible for the army. Tchang Kai-Chek was friendly disposed towards the communists and had just returned himself from a fairly long visit to Moscow.

At that time China was divided into three zones of influence: the North, which was in the hands of the war lords; the centre, with Hankow as its capital, which was in the hands of left-wing and mainly communist elements, and the South, whose capital was Nankin, which was controlled by the Kuo Ming Tan.

In April Marshal Tchang Tso Lin, Tchang Kai-Chek's ally, sacked the Soviet Embassy at Peking, to discover formal proof of Russian interference in the direction of the Chinese communist party and a plan to sabotage the nationalist movement. Alerted by this discovery, Tchang intercepted a secret message later in the month, which had been sent by Borodin, giving instructions as to how to sabotage the nationalist army. To put it briefly, Moscow was indeed prepared to help the Kuo Ming Tan army, but only for the eventual benefit of the communist party.

On 12th April the communists organized a general strike with a view to creating a revolutionary uprising in Shanghai. Tchang immediately seized the town and suppressed the communist movement in blood. Stalin sent Lominadze and Heinz Neumann to China in order to restore the situation. The latter, under the

pseudonym of Neuberg, published the famous plan for armed communist insurrection, and at Canton insurrection was raised in the town on Neumann's personal order.

On 11th December the communists seized the town for a brief three days of terror, ransacking and massacre. Tchang immediately retook the town and suppressed the revolt in blood. Nearly all the communist leaders were shot, and the survivors gathered round Mao Tse-tung and made their way painfully south. Subsequently they undertook a dramatic retreat, the famous Long March, which led them to Yen-an on the borders of Mongolia and the Russian-Chinese frontier. It seemed as if communism had been destroyed in China, and indeed it took a decade for the movement to gather way again.

It was in these conditions that Sorge was sent to China in order to reconstruct the Soviet network. He was given strict instructions to have no contact with the Chinese communist party and not to take part in any openly communist activity.

In January 1929 Sorge left for China. There he met Agnes Smedley, the famous American journalist who was a secret Soviet agent, and with her help he built up from Shanghai the base of a network which was to spread throughout the whole of the Far East, concentrating upon Japan at the time of the Second World War.

Sorge set up his headquarters at Shanghai, but spread his operations into all the big centres, notably Hankow, Nankin, Canton, Peking and all Manchuria. He was always travelling, he learnt the Chinese and Japanese languages, he studied the history, politics, culture and philosophy of the Far East, and built up a remarkable knowledge of Asian affairs in general. He never employed a Russian, but used German, Chinese, Japanese, American and Yugoslav agents.

In December 1932, Sorge returned to Moscow in order to discuss with the Russian leaders the new situation resulting from the Japanese penetration into Manchuria and the attack on Shanghai. It was agreed that Sorge should transfer his activities to Japan and set up an entirely new spy ring there. The international situation was very grave, for Japan had invaded Manchuria, which came within the Soviet sphere of influence, and was reaching on to the Siberian frontier. An incident could set off another Russo-Japanese war, but Russia herself was in the throes of collectivization and in the West the new Hitler menace was arising. It was vital for the Russians to know the intentions of the Japanese and German governments. Accordingly, Sorge was given a supremely important mission: to

find out the secret plans of the Japanese government and of the Japanese army.

In May 1933, Sorge left for Berlin in order to establish his cover story. By means of unknown influences he managed to get himself officially affiliated to the Nazi party and was given a job as Eastern correspondent for the principal German papers such as the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, which already employed Agnes Smedley as its China correspondent. As they had only just come to power, the Nazis had not yet perfected their redoubtable police system, and anyway there were certain to be communist agents working among their archives and records who would see to it that Sorge's communist past remained unknown. When he had got his papers in order, Sorge left for Japan via Canada and the United States, where he made contact with Soviet agents, and he disembarked at Yokohama on 6th September 1933. On presenting himself at the German Embassy and the German club he was accredited without any difficulty, and immediately the Komintern, at the request of the Red Army, began to reshuffle their agents throughout the world in order to place them at Sorge's disposition: the Yugoslav Voukelich, among others, was ordered to leave Paris for Tokyo, and the Japanese Miyagi came over from Los Angeles.

At first Sorge was simply a German newspaper correspondent of no particular importance, but he made friends with a Colonel Ott, who had just arrived in Japan. The latter knew nothing about the Far East, and Sorge's knowledge was an invaluable assistance to him. Soon Colonel Ott was made military attaché and raised to the rank of general, and finally he was appointed ambassador. Thereafter Sorge had access to the source of all official German news in Japan.

Gradually he became the ambassador's trusted adviser on all Eastern affairs. The ambassador freely showed him his official documents, exchanged points of view with him, and asked his advice, and following his example the heads of the other German missions did the same. Following the tripartite pact of September 1940, in the conclusion of which Sorge had played an important part, Germany entered into closer relations with Japan, and Sorge widened his sphere of information.

His lieutenant, Ozaki Hirozumi, held an equally confidential post under Prince Konoyé, and was kept informed of the intentions and decisions of the Japanese government. Finally, owing to his position in the press, a third member of the ring, the Yugoslav journalist Voukelich, was in close contact with the English and American Embassies at Tokyo.

Sorge not merely sent back news reports to Moscow; he collected

all the information which came in to him from his various sources, studied it, reflected upon it, came to an opinion about it, and finally set out his conclusions in a minutely prepared report which was sent to Moscow, and which was a mature distillation of his opinions and his personal judgement. His reports went to the highest Soviet authorities, probably to Stalin in person. What made him a truly exceptional agent was his remarkable knowledge of the East and his particular gift for distinguishing between what was important and what was not, between what was true and what was doubtful, and finally his perception and sure-footed judgement, which set an incalculable value on his personal conclusions. Here is some of the information Sorge transmitted to Russia, and I quote from General Willoughby, who was General MacArthur's chief of information services :

"From 1933 to 1935 Japanese activities in Manchuria, centring around the Chinese Eastern Railway in which the Soviet Union had a half interest, very naturally were of much concern to Moscow. Based on reports by Ozaki, Miyagi, and the then German Ambassador, Dr. Herbert von Dirksen, Sorge was able to report that Japan would not fight the USSR over the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway, would devote herself to the development of heavy industries in Manchuria, and would discuss a non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union. In fact, as Sorge was able to report on the basis of information secured through Miyagi and Ozaki in 1935, the Japanese government placed more stress on the China problem than on that of the Soviet Union and any possible advance to the North. The German-Japanese Anti-Comintern Pact of 1936 looked like the real thing, but Sorge was able to report from excellent German Embassy sources that although the Germans had wanted a military pact it was being limited to an anti-Comintern pact because of Japanese reluctance to have trouble with the USSR.

"Sorge made full reports on intentions and operations in North China after July 1937, as well as on the nature of Japanese mobilization. He transmitted Ozaki's estimate that Japan would fail in her plan to solve her North China problem by a fast campaign and that the war was bound to develop into a long struggle. Throughout the rest of the China War Sorge kept a steady flow of fundamental information to the USSR.

(Major General C. A. Willoughby : *Sorge, Soviet Master Spy*, p. 83, London, Wm. Kimber, 1952. Also published in the USA by E. P. Dutton as *Shanghai Conspiracy*)

"The European picture was very black in the spring of 1939. The USSR had a choice of negotiations either with the Anglo-French bloc or with the Germans. After they had learned from Sorge that the Germans had proposed to Tokyo, with the support of Ambassador General Oshima Hiroshi, an alliance directed against the USSR and Great Britain, but that the Cabinet, the navy and the Zaibats were all opposed to such an alliance and had blocked it, the Soviet government itself entered into the famous, and disastrous, nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany in August 1939. It was the signature of this pact, securing Hitler's Eastern frontier, which precipitated the Second World War by the invasion of Poland.

"At the time of the Nomonhan Incident, in the summer of 1939, when the Red Army and the Japanese Kwantung Army engaged in a full-scale, local war, the Red Army was able to learn Japanese intentions. They learned what units were being dispatched from what parts of Manchuria, as well as what reinforcements would come from Japan. Above all, they learned that the Japanese government did not intend to exploit this incident, but intended to settle it locally, and the Russians conducted themselves accordingly.

"On 16th February 1940, Sorge sent a reliable account of Japanese output of munitions, aircraft, and motor cars, along with a report on the factories making these materials as well as iron and steel. From time to time, he brought these figures up to date. In August 1941 he reported on Japanese petroleum resources, a top secret bit of information of the most vital importance in estimating both Japanese war plans and capabilities. He reported that there was in storage in Japan sufficient petroleum for a two years' use by the navy, half a year by the army, and half a year by the nation at large. His sources were the German Embassy and Miyagi.

"The crucial year was 1941. After earlier general reports, on 20th May 1941, Sorge flashed the urgent warning that the Reichswehr would concentrate from 170 to 190 divisions on the Soviet border and on 20th June would attack along the whole frontier. The main direction of the drive would be towards Moscow. It will be recalled that this attack did occur on 22nd June. Naturally, thereafter, the answer to the question of Japanese attack from the East became the most vital mission of the Sorge ring. . . . Without a sound answer, the Red Army could not draw on their Far Eastern Army for use in the West, and, as the event showed, only a massing of limitless reserves made possible the stopping of the

violent German thrusts. Sorge could not come by the answer immediately, partly because it had not been decided definitely by the responsible Japanese authorities. . . . By the end of August he reported that the German Embassy had lost hope of Japan's joining in the war against Russia in 1941.

"Sorge maintained a steady watch and reported on United States-Japanese negotiations during the summer and autumn of 1941. His information was full and accurate, since Ozaki was so close to Konoye, the key man in the negotiations (*ibid.*, pp. 84, 85).

"By 15th October Sorge had transmitted his final sober conclusions that the Japanese had decided to move south and that there now was no serious danger of an attack by the Kwantung Army across the Siberian frontier" (*ibid.*, p. 86).

This information was of inestimable value to the Russians. Thus alerted, they were able to withdraw from their eastern front and throw their Siberian divisions into the battle of Moscow. This marked a turning point in the war and probably sealed the fate of the German armies in Russia.

Not long afterwards, Sorge, Ozaki and all the members of their ring were arrested by the Japanese.

Once they had been arrested Sorge and Ozaki spoke freely and very fully, and gave the Japanese police complete details of their operations. They were not maltreated, and they were given every legal opportunity to present their defence. The judgement was extraordinarily mild, for only Sorge and Ozaki were condemned to death—they were hanged on 7th November 1944 at ten o'clock in the evening—and all the other members of the ring, who were given various sentences of imprisonment, were liberated as political prisoners by the American occupation troops in 1945. Miyagi and one other died in prison.

The fascination of the Sorge case lies not only in the light it threw upon the Far East, but also in the repercussions it entailed in the United States. When MacArthur's intelligence services discovered the reports of the case in the archives of the Japanese police, it was found that the names of a number of very important Soviet agents in the United States were mentioned in compromising circumstances, such as Agnes Smedley, Earl Browder, Gerhardt Eisler, Gunther Stein, and others.

The Sorge case had revealed Shanghai's importance as a centre of spying and communist agitation in the Far East. Thus alerted, the information services of General MacArthur made further enquiries and brought to light a number of very revealing facts and names.

"The Sorge story did not begin or end with Tokyo. It was no accident that Sorge served in Shanghai first, and that his later operations, localized in Japan, were only a facet in the general mosaic of Soviet and Komintern international strategy.

"Shanghai had been the focal point of Communist espionage and political subversion. . . . The miscellaneous records of the British and French Shanghai Municipal Police in the early thirties open up an astonishing vista on a fantastic array of Communist fronts, ancillary agencies, and the vast interlocking operations of the Third Internationale in China. It is in this particular period that the groundwork was laid for the Communist successes of today. . . . The role of Shanghai, a veritable witches cauldron of international intrigue, a focal point of Communist effort, already becomes apparent in the records of the Sorge trial and collateral testimony.

(General Willoughby, *op. cit.*, p. 223)

"We are dealing here with a conspiratorial epoch in the history of modern China. China was the vineyard of Communism. Here were sown the dragon's teeth that ripened into the Red harvest of today, and the farm labour was done by men and women of many nationalities who had no personal stakes in China other than an inexplicable fanaticism for an alien cause, the Communist 'jehad' for the subjugation of the Western world (*ibid.*, p. 225).

"The interlocking ramifications of these enterprises, on a state or national plan, can be traced on a global basis as well. This concept, of course, implies the existence of a sort of administrative general staff; we might as well accept the fact that it exists, and that its headquarters are in the Kremlin. When Sorge wanted assistants in Japan, they were summoned from all the corners of the world; when the Kremlin wanted to organize Chinese labour, British, American, French and Indian top-flight experts converged on China; when Smedley needed protection, the pink press sprang raucously to her defence; her false protestations were printed simultaneously in New York and Hong Kong. Perhaps the most striking instance is contained in the slippery meanderings of Gerhardt Eisler, almost caught in Shanghai and almost caught in New York; though fifteen years and 10,000 miles apart, Red mouthpieces then and later were ready to match their tainted skill against the judgment of government officers (*ibid.*, p. 237).

"It can at once be stated that the individual propagandists and operators like Smedley and Stein, and the horde of saboteurs,

agents, fellow travellers and dupes, unleashed by the Komintern, represents the major element in this Oriental disaster, and their nefarious work must be considered a contributory and even decisive factor. The intervention of American Communists in the Shanghai situation has been amply demonstrated . . . and unless we learn the art of self-defence in international terms, we will have the suicide of Western civilization on our hands" (ibid., pp. 255-256).

At this point, General MacArthur decided to publish the complete report of the Sorge case, with the agreement of the Minister of War at Washington, who had read and approved the text.

Then an incredible thing happened. The American progressives and Communists, realizing that they were directly implicated, reacted with extreme violence, and thereupon the official authorities in Washington disowned the report of Generals MacArthur and Willoughby.

"The news value of the Sorge story is self-evident; even more so its importance as a pattern of Soviet intelligence operation. In December 1948, the Secretary of the Army had taken steps to clear the story for release.

"The American press was thoroughly interested. In the normal course of events, following the initial release, the papers were waiting for further details, in particular for the release of documentary evidence, the confessions of the principal defendants, participants, and eye-witnesses.

"G-2 Tokyo was prepared to furnish this material, but the call never came. Instead, a few days later, a shocked and incredulous Headquarters, in Tokyo, became aware of what amounted to a virtual repudiation of the Sorge Spy Report by the very Washington authorities who had so eagerly negotiated for its release throughout an entire year.

"This official reversal was reflected in the staccato language of news service radios of the period:

WASHINGTON, 20TH FEB.: (INS): THE ARMY'S PUBLIC INFORMATION DIVISION SAID FLATLY SATURDAY THAT IT WAS WRONG AND IN ERROR IN CHARGING THAT AGNES SMEDLEY, AN AMERICAN WRITER, WAS A RUSSIAN SPY.

EYSTER SAID "THE DIVISION HAS NO PROOF TO BACK UP THE SPY CHARGES. THE REPORT WAS BASED ON INFORMATION FROM THE JAPANESE POLICE AND THE REPORT SHOULD HAVE SAID SO.

"WHILE THERE MAY BE EVIDENCE IN EXISTENCE TO SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS, IT IS NOT IN OUR HANDS.

"IT WAS A MISTAKE WITHIN THE DIVISION. THE STAFF FAILED TO HANDLE THE RELEASE PROPERLY. NO NAMES SHOULD HAVE BEEN USED AND NO CHARGES MADE."

WASHINGTON, 19TH FEB. (UP) IN NEW YORK, MISS SMEDLEY PROMPTLY CALLED THE CHARGES "DESPICABLE LIES" AND THERE WERE OTHERS WHO CRITICIZED THE ARMY'S METHOD OF BRINGING OUT THIS REPORT.

"The Army Department retraction was certain to cool off the eagerness of the press immediately.

"The direct practical effect of this inexplicable step was to suppress for the time being documentary evidence that normally would have reached the public. *Plain Talk* and *Counterattack* were among the first to recognize the vicious impact of this retraction.

"Agnes Smedley significantly got space on the air, hired a well-known attorney, and proceeded to defend her fair name. It was a foregone conclusion that this would be done. The implications of international conspiracy, in the Far East, were too overwhelming. Silence would have been fatal for the cause of Soviet penetration of the Orient, especially as the Chinese Communists were then already at the gates of Nanking.

"The psychological counterattack was cleverly managed. It was primarily directed at General MacArthur and its weapon was an insolent threat of suit for libel. The magic of MacArthur's name would automatically insure front space in the press. The fact that the release was a Washington-directed affair was blandly overlooked. Nor was there any point in suing me, though the direct responsibility for the preparation of the report, i.e. the substance of accusation, was obviously in my department.

"Agnes Smedley expressed her gratitude and appreciation to the Army for clearing her name and reputation of the outrageous and false charge. She hoped that the statement by Colonel Eyster 'marks the end of a policy of smear first—investigate later.' She called upon General MacArthur 'to waive his immunity and she would sue him for libel.' In Detroit, John Rogge, attorney for Smedley, asked rhetorically: '. . . First we want to know if MacArthur will accept responsibility for reports coming from his office, and if he will, I suggest he get a New York lawyer because we are going to sue. After we get an answer from MacArthur, then we will decide whether to sue Willoughby. MacArthur is the one Miss Smedley wants to sue. . . .'

"In order to relieve Rogge of this theatrical dilemma, I im-

mediately issued a public broadcast, in which I accepted suit with the deliberate intent, of course, of forcing the evidence into the open.

' . . . The Sorge Spy Report, collating and evaluating certain judicial and other official records found in Japan at the start of the Occupation, was made under my sole direction and, as Chief of Military Intelligence Section, Tokyo, I am responsible for its preparation and direct transmission to the Military Intelligence Division in Washington.

'I accept fully any responsibility involved and waive any immunities I may possess, to legal or any other action that may be taken or desired. I would in fact welcome, not only as an Intelligence Officer but even more fundamentally as an American citizen, an opportunity thus to emphasize the lurking dangers which threaten American Civilization in subversive systems, hiding behind and protected by our free institutions. . . .'

"The statement above, broadcast on the evening of 21st February, is not an ordinary action. It represents the public acceptance of a challenge, despite the fact that the official agencies in Washington appeared to side with an international espionage agent against a general officer of thirty-five years of continuous honourable military service.

"This length of military service obviously involves a certain amount of disciplined resignation. Officers do not lightly enter into a controversy with the War Department. . . .

"Traditional loyalty to superior authority, silent obedience, etc., were all involved in this scandalous incident, when the Sorge Espionage Case, an authenticated intelligence report, was released with considerable fanfare but retracted within seventy-two hours with quasi-apologies that ranged from an admission of editorial mistakes to the much more damaging innuendo that there was neither proof on hand nor any evidence to substantiate the allegations.

"As a matter of public safety, as well as government integrity, it is important to know why Smedley received the inferential protection of the Department and of the Secretary of the Army. It should be noted that from the hour of my broadcast, Smedley and her mouthpiece lapsed into complete and cautious silence. Incidentally, John Rogge, Smedley's lawyer, appears to handle a number of 'Red' cases. It is suggestive of his intellectual attitude that he demanded an end to the New York Grand Jury investigations into Soviet espionage activities. . . ."

(Major General Willoughby : *Sorge, Soviet Master Spy*, pp. 197-200)

... "After Washington had suppressed the proffered documentation, G-2 Tokyo found the going rough; the pack was in full cry; 'pink' riff-raff of every category, several second-rate columnists on the outer fringe of journalistic respectability, and a few opportunist politicians joined forces (*ibid.*, p. 201). . . . Communist publications, magazines and periodicals the world over rallied to the cause of Agnes Smedley while she was still alive. Her protest against the Army release of the Sorge Report was featured on 8th March 1949, by a mouthpiece for Chinese Communism, the *China Digest*, published in Hong Kong. At a distance of 10,000 miles, another Communist front, the *Far East Spotlight*, featured her story on practically the same date. This perfect timing, over vast geographical areas, is an impressive example of the first-class general staff work and split-second co-ordination of international Communism. The propaganda work of the timid and vacillating democracies cannot match this deadly precision" (*ibid.*, p. 203).

Who then was this Agnes Smedley at the centre of all this commotion?

For twenty years she was one of the most ardent propagandists on behalf of communist China, and in this capacity she exercised a vast influence on American public opinion, for it was she who propagated the fable that the Chinese communists were moderates who simply wanted to carry out agrarian reforms. Likewise, she was responsible for the sympathetic attitude towards communism of General Stilwell, who at that time was the American government's representative to Tchang Kai-Chek, before the latter's final defeat in China, and as we have seen, she belonged to the Sorge spy ring, and introduced him to Ozaki.

Agnes Smedley was born in Missouri in 1894 of a poor family. In 1912 she married an engineer, whom she divorced shortly afterwards. She then took a course at the University of New York, where she joined a group of Hindu nationalists. In 1918 she was arrested with Rabindranath Ghose, a political agitator, but the case never came to court. In 1920 she joined another professional Hindu revolutionary named Virendranath Chattopadhyaya, and lived with him for eight years. In 1928 she broke off relations with him and went to China as the correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, and in 1929 she took up residence at Shanghai, where French and British police records reveal that she was acting as an agent of the

komintern. It was at Shanghai that she became friendly with notorious Communists, such as C. Frank Glass, Harold Isaacs, Irene Wedemeyer, and Anna Louise Strong and others.

In 1933 she published a propaganda book in support of the Chinese communists entitled *China's Red Army Marches*, which included an account of Mao Tse-tung's "Long March" across China. It was banned by the nationalist Chinese authorities and by the Europeans at Shanghai on account of its violent attack on the opponents of Communism. Smedley had written it in a Soviet welfare centre in the Caucasus, where she had been receiving treatment for her health. In 1934 she travelled to Europe, returning to Shanghai the following year.

In August 1937 she went to Yenan, the capital of the Chinese communists, and became friendly with Chou En-Lai and above all with Chu Teh, who was commander of the 8th Chinese communist army. From this moment she unreservedly supported the cause of the Chinese communist armies, whose operations she followed across the country. In 1941 she fell ill and went to Hong Kong, and then returned to America where she conducted a very active propaganda campaign in favour of the Chinese communists.

In 1949, she crossed swords in a bitter encounter with MacArthur over the publication of the Sorge Report, but she was careful not to get involved in a case which would have brought out too much about her past. In 1950, just at the moment when she was due to appear before the commission of enquiry on Uni-American activities, she left hastily for London where she died suddenly in a clinic. She had nominated Chu Teh as her universal legatee, and her ashes were sent to China and buried with great ceremony in a cemetery at Peking which shortly afterwards fell into the hands of Mao-Tse tung.

And here we now set before the reader the final conclusion on the Sorge case as stated by General MacArthur in his reply to the memoirs of President Truman (translated from the French):

"The following events were probably finally responsible for my dismissal. In January I demanded that an enquiry should be opened in order to destroy a spy network which was responsible for the treasonable leakage of my ultra-secret reports to Washington. My campaign plans, including those of the 8th Army, were being daily communicated to Washington. General Walker was constantly complaining to me that the enemy had been informed of all his movements in advance. No such leakage occurred in Korea or Japan. Then suddenly one of my reports concerning the order of battle was published in a newspaper in

Washington several hours after it had been received. I insisted that those responsible should be brought to justice, in order to prevent the recurrence of this sort of thing, but nothing was done, and shortly afterwards I was relieved of my command.

"It is only quite recently, following the revelations which came out in the Burgess-Maclean spy trial, that I began to realize exactly what had been happening. These men, who had access to top secret government documents, were indisputable links in the spy chain which stretched from Washington to Korea, via Peking and Moscow. I am convinced that my demand for an enquiry, which followed on the heels of the Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White scandals, caused the liveliest resentment in government circles and was considered an anti-democratic manoeuvre.

"I am equally convinced that Red China's decision to launch an attack on Korea was undertaken with the assurance, provided from Moscow (through its American spy ring), that this measure would not draw down reprisals against the Chinese armies' bases and lines of communication in Manchuria. I do not want to cast a doubt upon the loyalty and patriotism of President Truman, but his obstinacy in refusing to admit the danger of red infiltration, and the way he sought to discredit as a red-herring any attempt to unmask this peril, is a staggering feature of this period."

(*US News and World Report*, issue of 17th February 1956)

To finish this chapter, we will briefly summarize the conclusions which may be drawn from these spy trials.

Firstly, the communists consider that they are in a state of permanent war with the rest of the world. This war is both revolutionary and totalitarian, and it is conducted on all fronts at once: it is military, political, scientific, industrial, commercial, artistic, and above all, philosophical and religious. At the same time, this permanent war is also a civil war. There is an interior front within all the western countries which is just as important if not more so than the exterior front, and the three main weapons of communism in this internal front are the official Communist Party, the underground networks and the support of liberals and progressives.

To take the Communist Party, this organization is a legally constituted entity free to carry out its antinational activity in broad daylight. It is in fact a fifth column in the service of a foreign government which itself is in a state of cold war with the western world.

The underground networks have four main tasks: to supply

information to the Soviet government, which is regarded as the world centre of the revolutionary movement; to set up cells within and infiltrate the western governments in order to exercise a political influence over them which is all the more efficient as it is secret; to set up cells within and infiltrate the different industries of the country in preparation for war and revolution by means of sabotage; and secretly to form groups ready to take power, which is the essential object of all the communist parties throughout the world.

With regard to the liberals and the progressives, as we have seen in the course of their trials, the communist agents are recruited from liberal and progressive intellectual circles, which possess in common, often unconsciously, an affinity of ideas and sympathies, and a sort of tacit alliance. Most of the agents to whom we have referred by name in this book were not even communists in the true sense of the word, and in this capacity they were often more useful to the Party than if they had in fact been members. They were not poor people, but intellectuals who had come from big Universities such as Cambridge in England, or Harvard and Colombia in the United States, or McGill in Canada. Many were often very gifted persons who commanded important posts, and some, such as Noel Field of the Vanderbilt family in America, or Raymond Boyer in Canada, were very rich.

As Chambers remarked, in the United States the working classes are democratic, the middle classes are republican and the upper classes and the intellectuals are communists. That is a fact which is not always sufficiently well grasped, but it is nevertheless more often true than not.

The existence of progressive circles facilitates the work of recruiting agents, and broadens its scope. It also assists the underground network of cells in their work of spying and collecting information, infiltrating and setting up cells in the government, and in the formation of new cells.

Furthermore, it is particularly efficacious in helping agents in difficulties arising from political enquiries or court cases.

When Alger Hiss was charged with spying, a number of well-known personalities took up his defence before public opinion, including Felix Frankfurter, a Justice of the Supreme Court, Dean Acheson, who was then in the State Department, and Truman, President of the Republic.

The Rosenbergs, also in America, were defended in front of public opinion by two of the most well-known scientists in the States: Einstein and Urey. Besides, a world-wide agitation in their favour was unleashed against the American government.

When General MacArthur denounced the American writer Agnes Smedley from the evidence revealed in the documents of the Sorge case, he was repudiated by his own Minister of War, who publicly defended Smedley against him, and when the General attempted to attack the progressive circles which surrounded Smedley, he was purely and simply dismissed.

Let us refer once more to the case of Carol Weiss King, the lawyer who was the recognized defendant of communists brought up on a charge before the American courts :

"Carol Weiss King and her law partner, the late Joseph R. Brodsky . . . played an exceedingly important role in the organization and direction of a wide variety of communist legal aid fronts in this country. The high level on which this lady operates is indicated by the fact that she has acted as counsel for Earl Browder, Israel Amter, Robert Minor, Sam Carr, of the Canadian espionage apparatus, Harry Bridges, Jay Peter, and the Eisler brothers, Hans and Gerhardt. She was also a contact for Hede Massing (Gumperz), when the latter was a Soviet agent in New York. . . . She got the Eislers into the country in the first place. Hans was held up in Cuba as a known Communist. An appeal was made to Mrs. Roosevelt, who appealed to the State Department. When the Consulate in Cuba remained firm, he was moved into Mexico and got in through that easy gateway."

(Maj.-Gen. C. A. Willoughby: *Sorge, Soviet Master Spy*, pp. 239-240)

Here was an instance of Mrs. Roosevelt intervening in person in favour of a communist agitator at the request of Carol Weiss King.

There was another typical case which had fairly wide publicity at the time, the *Amerasia* affair.

"Philip Jaffe, author of a pro-Communist book boosted by the *New York Times* . . . was the editor of the magazine called *Amerasia*. He had been intimate with Earl Browder, who had singled him out to influence American public opinion on the side of Red China. . . . *Amerasia* continued in existence until 1945 with a small circulation insufficient to pay the cost of printing.

"In that year it became involved in an incident which almost defies belief. There appeared in *Amerasia* a long account which was recognized in General William Donovan's Office of Strategic Services (the OSS) as an almost word for word reproduction from a government document of top secrecy. How did this get out. . . ? The head of the OSS investigating service entered the offices of

Amerasia magazine, by picking the lock, and found on the desks and in the files an alarming array of documents still bearing the top-secret mark of the State and other departments. They were from Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, Bureau of Censorship, British Intelligence, Office of Strategic Services and the State Department. The case was turned over to the FBI. Its agents, after working on the case for three months, swooped down on the *Amerasia* offices on 6th June 1945. They recovered 1,800 government documents stolen from the secret files of many war agencies of the government . . . all these facts were given to a grand jury which on 10th August brought in an indictment against Jaffe, Larsen and Roth. . . .

"How could the government have a clearer case than this? By this time the honeymoon between the United States and Russia was at an end. Yet here was an officer in Naval Intelligence (Roth) and a research agent in the State Department (Larsen) . . . involved at least suspiciously with two outright Communists who were running a pro-Communist magazine with their offices stuffed with stolen secret documents from the State and other departments, including Naval and Military Intelligence. . . . Among these documents were military reports giving secret information on the position and disposition of Chinese Nationalist armies—a subject of the greatest importance to the Communist military leaders in China. This was not a case of a single secret document gone astray. It was a whole officeful from many departments—a job which could have been carried on only through a long period of thefts by many hands.

"Now, the most startling feature of this case was its climax. The original indictments were quashed. Instead of charges of espionage, the charge of 'conspiracy to embezzle' was substituted against Jaffe, Larsen and Roth. Then Jaffe's attorney and the government's attorney got together and agreed on a swift court procedure. The government attorney said little. The defendants meant no harm . . . it was all a case of excessive journalistic zeal. Imagine an ordinary loyal newspaper reporter stealing 1,800 secret government documents just to check on the accuracy of his story. . . . ! The judge actually heard almost nothing about the case. He fined Jaffe \$2,500. Larsen got off with a \$500 fine. The case against Roth was dismissed . . . the government expressed the hope that the matter might be wound up without further delay, which was done. Of course, all this fantastic procedure took place on orders from Washington."

(J. T. Flynn : *While You Slept*, pp. 108-110)

"Now, what was the truth about *Amerasia*. . . ? Actually, it was projected and organized in the Institute of Pacific Relations . . . which belonged to the Communists Field and Jaffe . . . it was hardly a magazine at all. It was a front posing as a magazine which could be used as a safe cache for secret government documents and as a clearing house for secret government information . . . as we survey the IPR record no one can doubt that it played a powerful role in our State Department, and it is not out of place to note that Alger Hiss became a member of the board of the IPR. . . . Major General C. A. Willoughby testified under oath that the IPR Council in Japan was used as a spy ring by the Russians."

(J. T. Flynn, *ibid.*, pp. 110-112)

And that brings us to the conclusion of this study. The supreme danger is not from Communism in Moscow or Peking; the supreme danger lies in infiltration from underground networks in Paris, London and Washington, and in the secret links which bind them to liberal and progressive circles.

In June 1951, General MacArthur made a speech to the members of the Texas Legislature, in the course of which he stated:

"I am much concerned for the security of our great nation, not so much because of any potential threat from without, but because of the insidious forces working from within which, opposed to all of our great traditions, have gravely weakened the structure and tone of our American way of life."

(quoted in J. Beaty: *The Iron Curtain over America*, p. 193)

Finally, we will bring this chapter to its close with a quotation from J. T. Flynn:

"It is difficult to believe that so few people, so little known, without political influence on the nation as a whole, could accomplish so much. The trick lies in getting into positions where information can be controlled, where policies can be formed, getting into strategic spots where the switches which govern information, opinion and policy can be controlled. Take the case of Alger Hiss in the State Department and Harry Dexter White in the Treasury Department. There was Hiss at Yalta, White at Quebec, where world-shaking decisions were made to conform to Russian plans. All of these people comprised not more than 35 or 40 men and women—most of them writers and journalists, some of them Communist Party members or agents of some Communist apparatus, many of them mere dupes. They managed

to write most of the books and most of the book reviews, while taking their places in positions of the greatest strategic importance in departments of the government—State and War and Navy and OWI and other sensitive agencies. Think of the power of Lauchlin Currie in the President's own executive department as his adviser on Far Eastern affairs—Currie who was in the IPR and was identified by Elizabeth Bentley as a member of the Communist Silvermaster group in Washington. Think of Hiss, top-ranking man in the policy committee of the State Department. Think of Lattimore, adviser to Chiang Kai-shek—on Currie's recommendation—at a critical moment, adviser to the State Department, adviser to Wallace on his visit to Siberia and China. Think of Frederick Vanderbilt Field as executive secretary of the IPR, of John Carter Vincent as head of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, and a score of others we could name. These are the men and women who were able to change the course of history and embroil us in the fantastic snarl in which we find ourselves in the Far East."

(J. T. Flynn: *While You Slept*, p. 115)

"It is easy enough to diagnose the case of those men who were outright Communists or half-convinced fellow travellers. They knew what they believed and what they were aiming at. The trouble lies in tracing the illness which possessed the minds of men who were neither Communists nor Socialists, yet who could be afflicted with some disorder that brought them down to a point where they saw our problems almost precisely as the Reds saw them, and led them to become, in some cases the deluded, and in some cases the completely blind partner of the enemy. These aberrations led to a shockingly false conception of the war and its objectives and its meanings. In turn, by the most gigantic propaganda assault in history, they set out to fool the American people about the war and its purposes.

"While we arm against Russia, we remain defenceless against the enemies within the walls. It is they, not Stalin's flyers or soldiers or atomic bombers, who will destroy us."

(J. T. Flynn, *ibid.*, pp. 151, 152)

VIII

THE BROWNELL-TRUMAN CONTROVERSY

The Soviet spy drama, which had come to light with the revelations of Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers, did not end with the condemnation of Alger Hiss. It was to crop up again in a most spectacular manner several years later, in connection with Harry Dexter White, but this time ex-President Truman was directly implicated.

As the reader will remember, Harry Dexter White, a Jew of either Polish or Russian origin who had been naturalized as an American, was denounced by Whittaker Chambers as being one of the leaders of a Soviet spy ring in the United States. He had held a very important post in the Treasury and in the International Monetary Fund which had played such an important part in the economic measures taken by America with regard to Europe at the end of the Second World War. White died in 1948 a few days after making his only appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities which was investigating the Hiss affair. Truman was President of the United States at the time.

On 6th November 1953, the Attorney General of the United States (the Minister of Justice), Herbert Brownell Jr., stated publicly in a speech at Chicago that ex-President Harry Truman had at that time nominated Harry Dexter White to a post of the utmost importance, knowing perfectly well all the time that White was a communist agent.

Naturally, this allegation created a considerable stir.

Ten days later, Harry Truman himself was shown throughout America on a gigantic programme which was simultaneously broadcast by the four big television companies, and in which he presented his version of the story.

The complete text of this broadcast was published in France by the Paris edition of the *New York Herald Tribune* on 18th November 1953.

On the previous day, 17th November, Brownell had appeared before the Committee of Enquiry of the United States Senate and given a detailed explanation of the White affair which he had un-

veiled on 6th November, and on the same day J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation made a long statement to the same Committee on this subject.

Both Brownell and Hoover were very hard on ex-President Truman, and made formal accusations against him with supporting evidence.

These two statements were reproduced in full in the Paris edition of the *New York Herald Tribune* on 19th November 1953, and the same issue set out in rather ponderous terms the general conclusions which could be drawn from these three statements, and which likewise contained severe strictures against the former President.

Quoting from the respective editions of the *New York Herald Tribune* as indicated above, we will now set out an abridged version of the three statements; commencing with the television broadcast of former President Harry S. Truman:

"On 6th November, the new Administration, through Herbert Brownell Jr. . . . now serving as Attorney General, made a personal attack on me. . . . This attack is without parallel, I believe, in the history of our country. I have been accused in effect, of knowingly betraying the security of the United States. This charge is, of course, a falsehood, and the man who made it had every reason to know it is a falsehood. On 10th November, as a direct result of this charge, I was served with a subpoena of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which called on me to appear before it to be questioned about my conduct of the office of the President of the United States. . . ."

Truman then explained at length why he refused to appear before the House Committee.

"Now for the charge which Mr. Brownell made in his political speech—a charge that I knowingly betrayed the security of the United States. Let me read you what Mr. Brownell said. Mr. Brownell said: 'Harry Dexter White was known to be a communist spy by the very people who appointed him to the most sensitive and important position he ever held in the government service.' There can't be any doubt that Mr. Brownell was talking about me. . . ."

"His charge is false, and Mr. Brownell must have known it was false at the time he was making it.

"Mr. Brownell has made a great show of detail as to the dates on which particular FBI reports were forwarded by the Department of justice and the manner in which they were handled. As

Mr. Brownell should have learned by this time, a great many reports pass daily through the White House. It is not possible to recall eight years later the precise day or the precise document which may have been brought to my attention. . . .

"But of course I knew of the intensive investigation of Communist activity which was then going on and which involved many persons. As a matter of fact this investigation was one of the many important steps which my Administration took, beginning in 1945, to render the Communist conspiracy ineffective in this country. These steps included the successful prosecution and imprisonment of the top Communist leaders in the United States. . . .

"I have had my files examined and have consulted with some of my colleagues who worked with me on this matter during my term in office. The facts, as I have determined them in this matter, are these: in late 1945, the FBI was engaged in a secret investigation of subversive activities in this country. In this investigation, the FBI was making an intensive effort to verify and corroborate certain accusations of espionage made by confidential informants.

"A lengthy FBI report on this matter was sent to the White House in December 1945. The report contained many names of persons in and out of government service, concerning whom there were then unverified accusations. Among the many names mentioned, I now find, was that of Harry Dexter White, who had been in the Treasury Department for many years and who was at that time an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. As best I can now determine, I first learned of the accusations against White early in February 1946, when an FBI report specifically discussing activities of Harry Dexter White was brought to my attention.

"The February report was delivered to me by Gen. Vaughan and was also brought to my personal attention by Secretary of State Byrnes.

"This report showed that serious accusations had been made against White, but it pointed out that it would be practically impossible to prove those charges with the evidence then at hand.

"Immediately after the matter was brought to my attention, I sent a copy of the report, with a covering note signed by me, to White's immediate superior, the Secretary of the Treasury, Fred Vinson. In this note, dated 6th February 1946, I said: 'I suggest that you read it, keeping it entirely confidential and then, I think, you, the Secretary of State and myself should discuss the situation

and find out what we should do.' Later, I believe it was the same day, I discussed the matter with Secretary Vinson as well as with Secretary of State Byrnes.

"As I have mentioned, Mr. White was at that time an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. It had been planned for some time that he should be transferred from that position to be the United States member on the board of executive directors of the International Monetary Fund, a new international organization then in the process of being set up. His appointment had been sent to the Senate for this new position, and it was confirmed on 6th February shortly before I saw Secretaries Byrnes and Vinson. In this situation I requested Secretary Vinson to consult with the appropriate officials of the government and come back to me with a recommendation.

"Secretary of the Treasury Vinson consulted with Attorney General Tom Clark and other government officials. When the results of these consultations were reported to me, the conclusion was reached that the appointment should be allowed to take its normal course. The final responsibility for this decision, of course, was mine. The reason for this decision was that the charges which had been made to the FBI against Mr. White also involved many other persons.

"Hundreds of FBI agents were engaged in investigating the charges against those who had been accused. It was of great importance to the nation that this investigation be continued in order to prove or disprove these charges and to determine if still other persons were implicated.

"An unusual action with respect to Mr. White's appointment might well have alerted all the persons involved to the fact that the investigation was under way and thus endanger the success of the investigation. It was originally planned that the United States would support Mr. White for election to the top managerial position in the International Monetary Fund—that of managing director—a more important post than that of a member of the board of executive directors. But following the receipt of the FBI report and the consultations with members of my Cabinet, it was decided that he would be limited to membership on the board of directors.

"With his duties thus restricted, he would be subject to the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury, and his position would be less important and much less sensitive—if it were sensitive at all—than the position then held by him as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

"Tonight I want the American people to understand that the course we took protected the public interest and security and, at the same time, permitted the intensive FBI investigation then in progress to go forward. No other course could have served both of these purposes. The appointment was accordingly allowed to go through, and the investigation continued. In 1947 the results of the investigation up to that time were laid before a Federal Grand Jury in New York by the Department of Justice. Mr. White was one of the witnesses called before that grand jury. . . . In the meantime, Mr. White, in April 1947, resigned his office, referring to reasons of health."

Then the former President Truman launched into an extremely violent diatribe against Brownell, whom he accused of attacking him in bad faith in order to discredit the democratic administration in favour of the republican party.

"The whole history of our Republic", Truman continued, "does not reveal any other attack such as this by a new administration on an outgoing President. Up to now, no administration has ever accused a former President of disloyalty. . . . It is now evident that the present administration has fully embraced, for political advantage, McCarthyism. I am not referring to the Senator from Wisconsin—he's only important in that his name has taken a dictionary meaning in the world. It is the corruption of truth, the abandonment of our historical devotion to fair play. It is the abandonment of the law. It is the use of the big lie and the unfounded accusation against any American citizen in the name of Americanism or security. It is the rise to power of the demagogue who lives on untruth. It is the spread of fear and the destruction of faith in every level of our society.

"My friends, this is not a partisan matter. This horrible cancer is feasting at the vitals of America and it can destroy the great edifice of freedom. If this sordid, deliberate and unprecedented attack on the loyalty of a former President of the United States will serve to alert the people to the terrible danger that our nation and every citizen faces, then it will have been a blessing in disguise. I hope this will arouse you to fight this evil at every level of our national life."

(*New York Herald Tribune*, Paris, 18th November 1953)

Those are his very words. This horrible cancer, this terrible danger which threatens the American nation—what is it but McCarthy's anticommunism.

On 17th November 1953 the Attorney General replied to President Truman's speech with a statement which was made before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, from which we have extracted the most important passages as follows :

"Beginning in April 1953, this subcommittee has been holding a series of hearings for the purpose of exposing the plans of Communist agents to infiltrate the government of the United States. The work of this subcommittee has documented with great care the result of the very successful Communist espionage penetration in our government during World War II and thereafter. . . . The Executive department of the government, which is headed by the President, and of which the Department of Justice is part, has been concerned since we took office with cleaning out the government. One of the most important and vital problems is to remove all persons of doubtful loyalty and, most important, to prevent any further Communist infiltration into the government of the United States.

"On 6th November in Chicago, I made one of a number of speeches and magazine articles in which I publicly discussed the problem of Communist infiltration in government and the steps taken by the Eisenhower administration to meet that problem. In that speech I referred to the case of Harry Dexter White and the manner in which it was handled by the Truman administration on the basis of established facts and the records in the Department of Justice.

"It has been said that I implied the possibility that the former President of the United States was disloyal. I intended no such inference to be drawn. . . . I specifically said that I believed that the disregard of the evidence in the White case was 'because of the unwillingness of the non-Communists in responsible positions to face the facts and a persistent delusion that Communism in the government of the United States was only a red herring', and that 'the manner in which the established facts concerning White's disloyalty were disregarded is typical of the blindness which afflicted the former administration on this matter'.

"When this subcommittee completes its investigation, I believe that you will conclude, as I did, that there was an unwillingness on the part of Mr. Truman and others around him to face the facts and a persistent delusion that Communist espionage in high places in our government was a red herring. And I believe that you will conclude that this attitude, this delusion, may have resulted in great harm to our nation.

"The Truman administration was put on notice at least as early as December 1945, that there were two spy rings operating within our government. . . . White entered upon his duties and assumed the office of executive director for the United States in the International Monetary Fund on 1st May 1946. What was known at the White House of his espionage activities prior to that date?

"On 4th December 1945, the FBI transmitted to Brig.-General Harry H. Vaughan, military aide to the President, a report on the general aspects of Soviet espionage in the United States. . . . This was a secret and highly important report of some 71 pages. It covered the entire subject of Soviet espionage in this country both before, during and after World War II. It named many names and described numerous Soviet espionage organizations. Harry Dexter White and the espionage ring of which he was a part were among those referred to in this report . . . no reasonable person can deny that the summary, brief though it may be, constituted adequate warning to anyone who read it of the extreme danger to the country in appointing White to the International Monetary Fund or continuing him in government in any capacity, as the subcommittee knows.

"Copies of this report were sent to a number of Cabinet officers and high officials in the Truman administration, including the Attorney General. It would be difficult to understand how, under any circumstances, a document upon so delicate and dangerous a subject would not have been brought to Mr. Truman's attention.

"But in addition to the fact I have here a letter from J. Edgar Hoover to General Vaughan dated 8th November 1945. As you know, General Vaughan has testified before this subcommittee that by arrangement with Mr. Truman, when the FBI had information which it deemed important for the President to know about, it sent such information to him. Vaughan testified that he knew that any such report which came to him was delivered to the President."

Mr. Brownell then read out the contents of this letter, in which Hoover, the head of the FBI, drew Vaughan's attention to the importance of the report which accompanied it. The names of a certain number of persons who were Soviet agents, and all of whom occupied posts in the American government, were mentioned, especially Harry Dexter White, Gregory Silvermaster, George Silverman, Frank Coe, Laughlin Currie, Victor Perlow, Maurice Halperin and others; all these men were cited in the Chambers-Hiss trial.

The report stated that according to a confidential source of information, which had reached the FBI, Harry Dexter White had been active as a spy since 1942, and that the documents which he had obtained had been photographed in a secret laboratory in a cellar in Silvermaster's house. A special messenger then took the photographs to Jacob Golos and Gaik Ovakinian, two other Soviet agents who completed the link. Golos died on 27th November 1943, and thereafter the link was maintained by Dr. Abraham Weinstein and Anatole Gromov, who was first secretary in the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

Hoover also remarked that if White was nominated executive director of the International Monetary Fund he would be able to exert a great influence over all questions concerning international finance, and he added that he would not be able to keep him under effective surveillance since the offices of the International Monetary Fund were regarded as neutral international territory, and consequently FBI agents were not allowed to enter them.

Continuing his deposition, Mr. Brownell referred to the existence of a second FBI report which completed the first and which was especially concerned with White's spying activities since the end of 1945. To this day this report is still too secret for complete publication, but it mentioned White's frequent contacts with men who were known to be notorious communists by the FBI, and his close relations with Alger Hiss were also mentioned, as well as the *Amerasia* case, to which we will refer later on.

Mr. Brownell concluded his deposition with these words:

"No one could, with any validity, suggest today that there is doubt that White was in this espionage ring. Some of White's original espionage reports, written by him in his own handwriting for delivery to agents of the Red Army intelligence, were recovered in the autumn of 1948 and are now in the possession of the Department of Justice. . . . But the record which was available to the Truman administration in December 1945 and thereafter should have been sufficient to convince anyone that White was a hazard to our government.

"The question which had to be decided at that time was not whether White could have been convicted of treason. There was ample evidence that he was not loyal to the interests of our country. That was enough. Government employment is a privilege, not a right, and we don't have to wait until a man is convicted of treason before we can remove him from a position of trust and confidence. . . .

"However it now seems in the light of Mr. Truman's television speech of last night that it is conceded that on 6th February 1946, the day on which White's appointment was confirmed by the Senate, Mr. Truman did read the most important of the reports to which I referred, and that he thereafter, even though he had a legal right to ask that the nomination be withdrawn, signed White's commission and permitted him to take office on the 1st May with full knowledge of the facts reported by the FBI.

"It is of course extraordinary to learn from Mr. Truman, in view of his earlier statements, that he signed Mr. White's commission with the thought that it might help to catch him . . . it seems to me even more extraordinary to learn that Mr. Truman was aware as early as 1946 that a Communist spy ring was operating within his own administration, when for so many years since that time he had been telling the American people exactly the opposite. Indeed, it seems to me that this explanation of White's appointment—that is, that he was appointed and allowed to remain in office for more than a year in order to help the FBI trap him as a spy—raises more questions than it answers."

(*New York Herald Tribune*, Paris, 18th November 1953)

On 18th November, J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, made the following statement before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee. Hoover began by recalling that the FBI is a fact-finding agency and is not concerned with making decisions of policy. Its role is to supply the government with the information relative to the security of the country, and thereafter it is the latter's responsibility to take the decisions which it considers to be necessary. Hoover then continued:

"On 7th November 1945, Miss Elizabeth Bentley advised special agents of the FBI in considerable detail of her own career as an espionage agent. On 8th November a letter of that date was delivered to Brig-General H. H. Vaughan", which listed a certain number of persons who were working as Soviet agents. "Harry Dexter White was the second name mentioned in the list. The concluding paragraph of this three-page letter stated: 'Investigation of this matter is being pushed vigorously, but I thought you would be interested in having the foregoing data immediately.'

"In the meantime, our investigation of White and other members mentioned by Miss Bentley and Whittaker Chambers, as well as those individuals on whom we had adverse information from equally reliable sources, continued. A detailed summary memorandum was then prepared consisting of 71 pages, exclusive of the

index, setting forth the highlights of Soviet espionage in the United States. This memorandum, dated 27th November 1945, was delivered to General Vaughan by a special messenger on 4th December 1945. Copies of this memorandum were furnished to the Attorney General and certain other interested heads of government agencies. This memorandum included information on Harry Dexter White.

"When we learned that White's name had been sent to the Senate for confirmation of his appointment as a United States delegate on the International Monetary Fund, we then consolidated the information in our files . . . in a 28-page summary dated 1st February 1946, which was delivered to General Vaughan on 4th February 1946.

"From 8th November 1945 until 24th July 1946, seven communications went to the White House bearing on espionage activities, wherein White's name was specifically mentioned. During that same period, two summaries on Soviet espionage activities went to the Treasury Department and six went to the Attorney General on the same subject matter. The handling and reporting on the White case followed the bureau's traditional practice of reporting all facts and information which had come to our attention, without evaluation or conclusions.

"The information contained in the summary delivered to General Vaughan on 4th February 1946 came from a total of 30 sources, the reliability of which had previously been established. In connection with the sources, I would like to mention one in particular, Miss Bentley. From the very outset, we established that she had been in a position to report the facts relative to Soviet espionage which she has done. We knew she was in contact with a top-ranking Soviet espionage agent, Anatoli Gromov, the First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

"All information furnished by Miss Bentley, which was susceptible to check, was proven to be correct. She has been subjected to the most searching of cross-examinations. Her testimony has been evaluated by juries and reviewed by the courts and has been found to be accurate. Miss Bentley's account of White's activities was later corroborated by Whittaker Chambers and the documents in White's own handwriting, concerning which there can be no dispute, lend credibility to the information previously reported on White. Subsequent to White's death, on 16th August 1948, events transpired which produced facts of an uncontradictable nature which clearly established the reliability of the information furnished in 1945 and 1946.

"In the period from 8th November 1945 to 22nd February 1946, our first concern was to safeguard the government from infiltration by subversive elements. In fact, I took a strong stand because of the premature disclosures that would result if prosecution were initiated.

"In a conversation on 21st February 1946, the Attorney General informed me that he had spoken with the then Secretary of the Treasury, the late Chief Justice Fred Vinson, and the President, about White. The Attorney General stated he felt the President should personally tell White that it would be best for him not to serve. I told the Attorney General I felt it was unwise for White to serve. The Attorney General then stated he would like to confer with Judge Vinson and me on the following day.

"I advised Judge Vinson and the Attorney General that the character of the evidence was such that it should not be publicly disclosed at that time in view of the confidential sources involved. . . . I was at the meeting to furnish facts, which I did. There was no agreement while I was present between the Attorney General and Judge Vinson, other than that they should see the President with the Secretary of State.

"On 26th February 1946, I advised the Attorney General by telephone and subsequently by memorandum, of the receipt of information from a confidential source reflecting the possibility that White might have received some notice of either the cancellation or impending cancellation of his appointment.

"Mr. Virginius Frank Coe, a close associate of White's, became the secretary of the International Monetary Fund in June 1946, which position he held until 3rd December 1952, when he was dismissed after invoking the Fifth Amendment in an appearance before this committee last December. It is particularly significant that he declined to answer questions regarding his relationship with White. Information on Coe had been furnished to the White House as early as 25th February 1946, to the Attorney General on 23rd and 25th February 1946, and to the Treasury Department as early as 4th March 1946.

"From the foregoing, it is clear that the FBI called to the attention of the appropriate authorities the facts as alleged by reliable sources, which were substantial in pointing to a security risk, as they occurred."

(New York Herald Tribune, Paris, 19th November 1953)

The whole American press commented on the depositions of these three outstanding public personalities, and the *New York Herald*

Tribune weighed out the conclusions in a well-measured editorial, from which we have taken the following extracts :

"In two extraordinary presentations, watched by virtually the whole country, the principal actors in the White case have now had their say. Ex-President Truman's broadcast address was marked by a depth of bitterness and a violence of language rare in public life; he took the offensive in a broadside political attack on the Attorney General. Before a committee Mr. Brownell replied with a lawyer's cool skill. He got the discussion back to the question of blindness and laxity in the previous administration and stirred grave doubts on the ex-President's defence.

"Mr. Truman put the veracity of Mr. Brownell at the centre of the controversy; and now the public finds itself asking which of these two men is closer to the truth. Did Mr. Brownell lie when he said that Mr. Truman knowingly appointed a spy to the most important sensitive position he had ever held? Did Mr. Truman lie when he said that he deliberately let the appointment run its normal course in order to track down the spy ring? It is a degrading thing to ask such questions about public servants; actually 'lying' should not have to enter the discussion. Let it be admitted that Mr. Brownell overstated his case at Chicago. It will likewise have to be admitted even by his most partisan supporters that Mr. Truman clearly overstates now, in his efforts to put the best light possible on his past conduct, the degree to which he was influenced by a determined plan to track down the government spy ring.

"Certainly Mr. Brownell's testimony makes it appear that no concerted efforts were made by the democratic administration to remove those named by the FBI as part of the same spy ring with White. Long after White himself had left office, others (as the Attorney General made damningly plain) continued in positions of responsibility. No proof of any kind has been adduced by the ex-President to show that his plan for getting full evidence and taking firm action on suspected spies—assuming such a plan to have existed—was actually carried out. The Attorney General indeed stated specifically that he knew of no precautions or directives resulting from the decision to keep White in government employ. . . .

"Human motives are mixed . . . the vicious charge of untruth which Truman saw fit to level against the Attorney General need not be turned now against a former President of the United States. But what at this stage needs, in our opinion, to be turned

against him is the charge of laxity and confusion in the highest and most serious of responsibilities. It is not pleasant to contemplate these matters which time has mercifully put behind us . . . but when men like Truman and those around him are shown to have been so blind and mistaken, the need to get at the facts is overpowering.

"Unfortunately, the facts are not simple . . . Mr. Truman would have preserved the country from infinite groping and uncertainty if he had appointed in his administration an impartial commission to sift all the evidence and state positive conclusions. He failed to do this; and in spite of a fighting defence, he cannot but be judged to have failed in convincing the country that he dealt effectively with the mortal threat of subversion."

(*New York Herald Tribune*, Paris, 19th November 1953)

IX

AMERICA AND ISRAEL

In the previous chapters of this work we have shown by reference to precise facts and documents—Zabrowsky, Landman and Morgenthau—the enormous influence which American and principally Zionist Jews have exercised on the foreign policy of the USA government.

But quite recently an American diplomat called David Nes, who has retired after twenty-six years' service in the State Department, published an article in the *London Times* of 5th February 1971 which brought to light new information on this subject. Entitled "America's very special relationship with Israel", his article confirms and indeed amplifies everything that we have said and written in the present work. Reading this article, we receive the very distinct impression that American foreign policy is inspired, guided and virtually laid down by the Zionist lobby.

Mr. David Nes was well placed to know what he was talking about, for he was Chargé d'Affaires, representing the American government at Cairo, immediately before and after the Six Days War between Israel and the Arab States. The following passages contain the essence of the article in question, which was only published in the early editions of *The Times* of that date, and responsibility for which remains entirely with its author.

"The White House invitation and reception recently accorded Israel's Defence Minister, Moshe Dayan, is illustrative of the very special relationship the United States has developed with his country over the past twenty-two years. It is doubtful whether a NATO or SEATO defence chief would have been granted such high protocol treatment. Most would have had to be satisfied with meeting the Defence Secretary or, in exceptional cases, the Secretary of State or the Vice-President.

"When President Truman said in October 1948: 'We are pledged to a State of Israel, large enough, free enough and strong enough to make its people self-supporting and secure', the stage was set for the gradual establishment of an association between

the United States and another country unique in American history. Today, that association is far closer in all areas—defence, economic collaboration, intelligence exchange, common citizenship, and mutual diplomatic support—than that enjoyed, for example, between the United States and Great Britain.

“Unique also is Israel’s almost total immunity from criticism in the United States—a situation hardly paralleled by any of our European or Asian allies, many of whose faults and frailties are daily aired in our communications media and by our legislative representatives. Perhaps, as James Reston of the *New York Times* suggested a short while ago, ‘. . . you can put it down as a general rule that any criticism of Israel’s policies will be attacked as anti-semitism’. And so it goes in reverse, with Israel’s image as a small, democratic, courageous little country struggling to survive in a sea of uncivilized, bloodthirsty, pro-communist Arabs, representing, rightly or wrongly, the view of most Americans. A new, very impressive colour documentary film on *Israel and the Bible* sponsored by Billy Graham and to be shown in 1,200 churches throughout the United States each month, will support this image.

“In dollars and cents, America’s assistance to Israel through the years, both governmental and private, has been prodigious. During the 20-year period between 1948–1968, the United States government economic aid totalled \$11,000m, while dollar transfers from private sources amounted to \$25,000m, a total of \$36,000m, or \$1,400 per capita on a current population of 2,500,000. This greatly exceeds on a per capita basis United States assistance to any ally and compares to \$35 per capita to the peoples of thirteen neighbouring states. Since 1968, American assistance to Israel has greatly increased. Dollar transfers in 1970 reached \$800m, and in 1971 will approximate \$1.5 billion.

“Until 1967, we assured Israel a continuing supply of modern military equipment directed through West Germany and France and we were thus able to avoid Arab hostility. However, with the conclusion of German ‘reparations’ and De Gaulle’s change in Middle East Policy, America has since 1967 become the exclusive purveyor of arms to Israel. Of greater significance is the fact that qualitatively America has provided aircraft, missiles, and electronic systems of greater sophistication and greater strike capability than those furnished to our NATO and SEATO allies. For example, Greece, Turkey and Iran, which form the northern tier defence line against the Soviet Union, have not yet received our Phantom aircraft. A few weeks ago, the House of Repre-

sentatives passed an amendment to the Defence Procurement Bill giving the President open-ended authority to transfer military equipment to Israel without total cost limitation. . . . Great Britain at the height of its struggle against Hitler never received such a blank cheque. Nor, in more recent times, has South Vietnam. . . .

"In the area of nuclear weapons, the United States has also pursued an exceptional position vis-à-vis Israel. During the years when we were pressing over one hundred nations in the world community with whatever diplomatic, economic and military leverage we might have to adhere to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Israel alone was exempted from strong representations. In fact we may have encouraged Israel to refrain from assuming the obligations set forth in this international undertaking. Through a study prepared at White House request by the Rand Corporation of California, we provided Israel with the most advanced technical and political data on the effective use of nuclear weapons in the Middle East. *The Jewish Press* in December summarized the nuclear situation: 'The experts who before the Six Day War felt that India would become the next member of the nuclear club now believe that the next member will be Israel'. This in fact has already occurred . . . in contrast to our intense opposition to France's nuclear development, the United States has supported Israel in virtually an identical policy.

"In the exchange of intelligence, American co-operation with Israel is unprecedented and goes far beyond the special nuclear arrangements with Great Britain based on the McMahon Act. During the months before the June 1967 hostilities, the military intelligence requirements required by Washington from American Embassies, the Central Intelligence Agency and military intelligence staffs in the Middle East were very largely based on Israel's needs, not on American interests. The effectiveness of the Israeli air strikes on 5th June 1967 was assured at least in part by information on Egyptian airfields and aircraft disposition provided through American sources. With political and economic information, it has long been State Department practice to provide the Israeli Embassy in Washington with copies of all of our reports from Middle East Embassies considered to be of interest. A summary by Ray Vickers about this co-operation appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* on 12th February 1970. When the American Naval Intelligence ship *Liberty* was attacked by Israeli air and sea units in June 1967—with the loss of 34 dead and 71 injured—the incident resulted in minimum official reaction. It

boggles the imagination to speculate as to the reaction were the attackers to have been British or French, much less Egyptian, as initially assumed.

"Israel also enjoys an exceptional position on the question of dual citizenship. Under long-standing citizenship laws an American voting in the elections or serving in the armed forces or government of a foreign country loses his citizenship. By a recent Supreme Court interpretation, Americans may serve in Israel in this manner without loss of citizenship. Under the Israeli Law of Return, an American Jew entering Israel is automatically given Israeli nationality.

"Since the war in June 1967, and particularly during the past year, American commitments to Israel have been greatly expanded. Before 1967 the United States was committed to Israel's territorial integrity within the 1948 armistice lines and to her economic viability. . . . In the United Nations Resolution of November 1967, America in effect opposed Israel's retention of the territories conquered by force the previous June. This fundamental position has now changed very radically. Last summer, in a series of statements from the Sam Clemente 'White House', the Nixon Administration would appear to have extended the territorial integrity commitment to include, until a final peace settlement, the occupied territories; to have moved from assuring a military balance, to guaranteeing Israel a 'military superiority capable of launching a rapid knock-out blow' against her neighbours, and to have supported Israel's continued 'racial exclusiveness', thereby negating our eighteen years of support for the United Nations Palestine refugee formula of 'repatriation or compensation'. When asked during the 10th December Press Conference whether America still adhered to its position on Israeli withdrawal from the 'occupied territories', President Nixon, for the first time, evaded the issue by saying that it was a matter for negotiation.

"Finally, the assignment and advancement of personnel in the Department of State to the top positions relating to the Middle East policy, have traditionally been subjected to prior approval by the American Zionist leadership. As an example in reverse, the firing of the United Nations Ambassador, Mr. Charles W. Yost, was demanded by the 'pro-Israeli lobby', as recently reported by the columnists Evans and Novak.

"This special relationship would appear to have the full and massive support of most Americans and certainly of the Congress and the press. It is hardly surprising therefore, that every Ad-

ministration since that of President Truman has worked towards establishing closer and more cordial ties with Israel as one of the cardinal principles of American foreign policy. General Moshe Dayan, when he met President Nixon, was in a far more enviable position than other top foreign leaders visiting Washington, whether they be Mr. Heath, M. Pompidou, or Herr Willy Brandt, or representatives of Asian, African or Latin American countries friendly to the United States.

"Only history can provide the total explanation for this very special American-Israeli relationship. It has now reached a point where Israel's security and welfare is considered vital to American welfare, but our reaction to any threats against Israel is more intense than with any of our NATO or SEATO allies. One State Department humorist has said: 'Were Israel's survival to be seriously threatened, we would be in the Third World War in two minutes—with Berlin it might take several days!'"

(The Times, 5th February 1971)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- M. BAR-ZOHAR, *Les Vengeurs*.
BARTZ, K., *Quand le ciel était en feu*.
BEATY, J., *The Iron Curtain over America*.
DILLON, DR. E. J., *The Peace Conference*.
DOENITZ, GRAND ADMIRAL, *Ten Years and Twenty Days*.
DOUSSINAGUE, J. M., *España tenía Razon*.
FLYNN, J. T., *While You Slept*.
The Forrestal Diaries.
GANNON, R. I., SJ, *The Cardinal Spellman Story*.
IRVING, D., *The Destruction of Dresden*.
KAUFMAN, T. N., *Germany Must Perish*.
LANDMAN, S., *Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine*.
LUDWIG, E., *A New Holy Alliance*.
MALYNSKI, E., *La Démocratie Victorieuse*.
MONTIGNY, J., *Le Complot contre la Paix*.
Morgenthau Diary
ROOSEVELT, E., *As He Saw It*.
SNOW, SIR C., *Science and Government*.
VEALE, F. J. P., *Advance to Barbarism*.
WHEELER-BENNETT, J. W., *The Drama of the German Army*.
WILLOUGHBY, MAJOR-GENERAL C. A., *Sorge, Soviet Master Spy*.

INDEX

- Acheson, Dean, 165
 Adler, Solomon, 99, 133
Amerasia, 166-8, 177
 Amter, Israel, 166
 Arabs, the, 13-15
 Arnold, General, 42, 43
 Atlantic Charter, 85, 127
 Attlee, Earl, 47
 Austria, 25, 90, 91
 Balfour Declaration, 11-16
 Barbusse, H., 19
 Bartz, K., 49
 Baruch, Bernard, 31, 96, 123, 132, 134, 136, 138
 Bar-Zohar, M., 136, 139-49
 Beatty, J., 23, 168
 Belgium, 18, 19
 Bell, Dan, 96, 105
 Bell, Dr., 43
 Bentley, Elizabeth, 99, 102, 103, 107, 108, 113, 125, 169, 170, 178, 179
 Berl, E., 31
 Bernstein, Lt.-Col. B., 104, 106, 107, 125, 126
 Beveridge, Lord, 127
 Bitterman, H. J., 107
 Blum, L., 24, 26, 31
 Boettiger, Lt.-Col. J., 106, 115, 120
 Bonnet, 25
 Bormann, M., 57
 Borodin, 152
 Boyer, Raymond, 165
 Brandeis, Justice, 12
 Brautigam, Dr., 61-3
 Brazil, 79
 Bretton Woods Conference, 104
 Bridges, Harry, 166
 Brodsky, J. R., 166
 Browder, Earl, 157, 166
 Brownell, H., 8, 100, 133; Chap. VIII
 Bullitt, 30-2
 Busse, General, 71
 Byrnes, 127, 172, 173
 Caballero, Largo, 84
 Calley, Lieut. W., 72, 73
 Canaris, Admiral, 59, 60, 134
 Carr, Sam, 166
 Carvin, General, 71
 Casablanca Conference, 32, 48, 138
 Cecil, Lord Robert, 14
 Chamberlain, 27, 30, 31
 Chamberlain, W. H., 119
 Chambers, Whittaker, 99, 103, 125, 170, 176, 178, 179
 Cherwell, Lord, 111-113
 Chiang Kai-shek, 89, 152, 162, 169
 Chou En-Lai, 163
 Chu Teh, 169
 Churchill, Winston, 27-30, 32, 37, 47, 51-4, 77, 78, 86, 89-93, 101, 104, 111-13, 116, 119, 128, 135
 Clark, Tom, 173
 Clay, General Lucius, 125
 Clayton, 123, 124
 Clemenceau, 21
 Coe, Frank, 98, 104, 107, 113, 118, 120, 121, 131, 176, 180
 Coolidge, 19
 Cooper, Duff, 28
 Corneau, Brother, 18, 20
 Crowley, 124
 Currie, Lauchlin, 99, 101, 118, 124, 125, 133, 169, 176
 Czechoslovakia, 25, 78, 88
 Daladier, 26-8, 30, 33
 Dayan, Moshe, 183, 187
 de Gaulle, General, 29, 74, 133, 184
 de Launay, J., 62
 de Monzie, 32, 33
 Dentz, General, 74
 Dillon, E. J., 21
 Doenitz, Grand Admiral, 49, 57, 64-72
 Donovan, General W., 166
 Doussinague, J. M., 75-87
 Dubois, 110, 121-24
 Dunn, J. C., 118
 Eden, Anthony, 111
 Egypt, 78
 Ehrenburg, Ilya, 67
 Einstein, 165
 Eisenhower, General, 42, 43, 48, 65, 68, 70, 72, 86, 104, 105, 110, 117, 126, 175
 Eisler, Gethardt, 157, 158, 166
 Estonia, 85
 Europe, 33, 34; Council of, 80; United States of, 24
 Eyster, Colonel, 159, 160
 Falco, R., 56
 Field, F. Vanderbilt, 169
 Field, Noel, 165
 Fitzmaurice, G. H., 12
 Flynn, J. T., 167-69
 Forrestal, 30, 31
 France, 10, 22, 24, 25-30, 32, 78, 79
 Franco, General, 80, 83
 Frank, 57
 Frankfurter, Felix, 31, 165
 Freemasonry, 19, 20
Freemasonry and the Vatican, 89
 French Revolution, 19
 Frick, 57
 Friedeburg, 64, 68, 70, 71
 Friedmann, W., 127
 Fritzsche, 57
 Funk, 57
 Galen, 152
 Gannon, R. I., 89-94
 Geblen, 62

- Germany, 9, 12, 14, 18, 22-7, 30, 91
 Glass, C. Frank, 163
 Glasser, Dr. H., 104, 108, 110, 118, 120, 121,
 123, 124, 131, 132
 Goebbels, 62, 63, 116, 137, 138
 Goering, 57, 66
 Goldmann, Dr. Nahum, 50, 51
 Golos, Jacob, 177
 Gout, M., 12, 13
 Graham, Billy, 184
 Graham, Rt. Hon. Sir R., 12
 Great Britain, 11-17, 25-30, 77
 Greece, 78
 Greenberg, 12
 Gromov, Anatole, 177, 179
 Gros, Prof. A., 56
- Halperin, M., 176
 Hankey, Lord, 43
 Harriman, Averell, 89
 Harris, Sir A., 46, 47
 Hayes, Carlton, 81, 82, 83
 Herriot, 26
 Hess, 57
 Himmler, 62, 65
 Hiroshi, General Ashima, 156
 Hitler, frequently
 Hiss, Alger, 164, 165, 168-170, 176, 177
 Hoover, Calvin, 116
 Hoover, Herbert, 121
 Hoover, J. Edgar, 100, 102, 103, 131, 171,
 176-78
 Hoover, President, 114
 Hopkins, H., 108, 109, 119
 House, Brother, 18
 Hozumi, Ozaki, 150, 151, 154, 157, 162
 Hull, Cordell, 76, 92, 97, 101, 105, 106, 109,
 110, 113-16
L'Humanité, 19
- Inge, Rev. W. R., 43
 Inonou, President, 78
 International League against Antisemitism, 25
 International Monetary Fund, 170, 173, 176,
 177, 179
 Irgoun, the, 16
 Irving, D., 39-47
 Isaacs, Harold, 163
 Israel, special relations with USA, 183-187
 Italy, 24, 25, 78, 79, 82
- Jackson, Justice R. H., 50, 55, 56, 58, 125
 Jaffa, Philip, 166-168
 Japan, 25, 85, 88, 100, 112
 Jeanneney, 26
 Jewish Boycott Conference, 23
 Jodl, 57, 64, 66, 70-2
 Jordana, Count, 75, 76, 82, 83, 85 87-89
 Joukov, Marshal, 71
 Jowitt, 56
Judaism and the Vatican, 133
- Kaltenbrunner, 57
 Kaplan, Irving, 107, 131
 Katyn Forest Massacre, 54
 Kaufman, T. N., 48, 136, 138, 139, 149
 Keitel, 57, 60, 62, 66, 71
 Kennedy, J., 30
 King, Carol Weiss, 166
 Kinzel, General, 68, 69
 Kissinger, Dr. Henry, 17
 Kleist, Marshal, 61, 63
 Klotz, Mrs. H., 96
 Knappen, Marshal, 130
 Kononow, 63
 Konoye, Prince, 150, 154, 157
 Korean War, 8, 88
 Köstring, General, 68, 69
 Krock, Arthur, 115, 116
- Kubek, Dr. A., 95, 99
 Kuo Ming Tan, 152
- Landman document, the, 8, 9-17
 Larsen, 167
 Lattimore, 169
 Latvia, 85
 Lawrence of Arabia, 15
 League of Nations, 18-20, 89
 Leahy, Admiral, 119, 126
 Lehey, Brother, 18-20
 Lebrun, 26, 33
 Lémery, 27
 Lenin, 21, 22
 Levy, L., 24
 Lindemann, 8, 9-17, 37, 38, 41, 47
 List, Marshal, 61, 63
 Lithuania, 85
 Litvinoff, 77
 Lloyd George, 21
 Lohr, General, 71
 Lominadze, 152
 London Agreement, 56
 Lovett, 124
 Lubin, Dr., 122, 124
 Ludendorff, General, 14
 Ludwig, E., 8, 23, 24
Lusitania, 9, 10
- MacArthur, General 8, 155, 157, 159, 160, 163,
 166, 168
 Macdonagh, General Sir G., 12
 McCloy, 120
 McNeil, H., 127
 Malcolm, J. A., 12, 13
 Mandel, 26-29, 31
 Malynski, E., 9, 11
 Mao Tse-tung, 153, 163
 Marshall, General, 115, 129
 Marx, Karl, 151
 Masonic Congress of Paris, 18-20
 Massing, Hede, 166
 Melchett, Lord, 14
 Meoni, Brother, 19
 Mexico, 22
 Middleton, Drew, 126
 Minor, Robert, 166
 Miyagi, 154-56
 Molotov, 100
 Mond, Sir A., 14
 Montgomery, Field-Marshal, 58, 68, 69, 72, 92
 Montigny, J., 8, 24-9, 32-4
 Morgenthau, 8, 31, 48, 59, 66, 92; *Diary*
extracts, 95-132, 138
 Motzkine, L., 21, 22
 Munich crisis, 31, 102
 Murphy, General, 65
 Mussolini, 25, 114
- Nes, David, 183-87
 Neumann, Heinz, 152, 153
 Neurath, 57
 Nikitchenko, General T., 56
 Nixon, President, 8, 17, 186, 187
 Nogués, 22
 Norway, 22
 Nuremberg Trials, 8, 35, 50-74, 146
- Ormsby Gore, Rt. Hon. W., 12
 Ott, Colonel, 151, 154
 Otto of Austria, 91
 Ovakinian, Gaik, 177
- Palestine, 11-18, 21
 Pearl Harbour, 32, 102, 150
 Pehle, J., 96, 108
 Peigné, Brother General, 20
 Perlo, V. 131, 176
 Pétain, 26, 28-30

- Peter, Jay, 166
 Picot, G., 12, 13
 Pius XII, 82
 Poland, 21, 26, 27, 30, 78, 85, 90, 91, 93
 Portugal, 78, 79
 Potocki, Count, 31
 Potsdam Conference, 69, 101, 106, 126, 127
 Pravbin, Ladimir, 116

 Quebec, Conference of, 66, 92, 97, 104, 108,
 111-17, 119-21, 128, 135, 168

 Raeder, 57, 66
 Rassinier, Paul, 134, 136
 Rendulic, General, 71
 Reynaud, P., 25-9, 33
 Ribbentrop, 57, 60
 Riddleberger, J., 109, 129
 Rogge, John, 160, 161
 Rommel, Marshal, 59, 134
 Roosevelt, Elliot, 32, 51-4
 Roosevelt, F. D., 7, 22, 30-32, 48, 49, 51-53,
 59, 66, 76, 79-81, 86-9, 91-4, 96, 97, 104,
 111, 113, 116, 117, 119-22, 126, 128, 132,
 135, 136, 139
 Roosevelt, Mrs., 166
 Rosenberg, 57, 61-3, 165
 Rosenfeld, 24
 Roth, 167
 Rothschild, Maurice, 28
 Rothschilds, the, 33
 Royan, Congress of, 24

 Samuel, Sir H., 12
 Saundby, Sir R., 46
 Sauckel, 57
 Schacht, 57
 Schirach, 57
 Schmidt, General, 63
 Schoerner, 71
 Schwerin-Krosigk, Count, 65, 69
 Scott, G. P., 12
 Seyss-Inquart, 57
 SHAEF, 106
 Shawcross, Sir H., 56
 Siegfried Line, 25
 Silverman, A. G., 118, 125, 133, 176
 Silvermaster, N. G., 99, 101, 113, 118, 133, 169,
 176, 177
 Sinclair, Sir A., 38, 44, 45
 Six Million - the six million question, 133, 134
 Smedley, Agnes, 153, 154, 157-63, 166
 Smith, General Bedell, 70, 72
 Snow, Sir G., 37, 38
 Sokolow, 12
 Sorge, Adolphus, 151
 Sorge, Richard, 150-60
 Spaatz, General, 42, 43
 Spain, 75-88
 Spears, General, 27, 29
 Speer, 57
 Spellman, Cardinal, 89-94
 Stalin, 21, 22, 31, 32, 51, 52-4, 61, 67, 76-9,
 86-8, 90, 93, 107, 119, 155
 Steed, Wickham, 14
 Stein, Gunther, 157, 158
 Stern gang, 16
 Stettinius, 120
 Stilwell, General, 162
 Stimson, 97, 101, 105, 106, 109-14, 116, 121,
 122, 129, 135
 Stokes, R., 43-5
 Streicher, 57

 Strong, A. L., 163
 Stumpff, General, 71
 Sulzberger, Arthur, 115
 Sun Yat Sen, 152
 Suslov, 133
 Sykes, Sir Mark, 12-14

 Taylor, T., 72-4
 Taylor, W. H., 110, 118
 Tchang Tso Lin, Marshal, 152, 153
 Tcheran Conference, 51-4, 66, 79, 86, 93
 Temperley, Prof. H. M. V., 13
 Thirty Years War, 65
 Timoshenko, 77
 Tokyo Trial, 55
 Transvaal War, 9
 Trenchard, Air Marshal, 36
 Trotsky, 22
 Truman, President, 101, 122, 126, 133, 163-65
 170, 183, 187
 Turkey, 22, 78

 Ukraine, 21, 25
 Ullmann, W. L., 118, 131, 133
 Untermeyer, S., 22
 Urey, 165

 Vaughan, General, 172, 176, 178, 179
 Veale, F. J. P., 38, 53, 54
 Versailles, Treaty of, 8 and Chap. II
 Viet Cong, 88
 Vincent, J. C., 169
 Viner, Prof. J., 98
 Vinson, Fred, 172, 173, 180
 Von Bock, Marshal, 62
 Von Dirksen, 155
 Von Kesselring, 66
 Von Kluge, 59, 62, 134
 Von Manstein, 66
 Von Papen, 57
 Von Schenkendorff, General, 63
 Von Schleicher, General, 134
 Von Stauffenberg, Col. Count, 59, 62
 Von Stulpnagel, 59
 Von Wedel, General, 63
 Von Witzleben, 59, 134
 Voukelich, 154

 Walker, General, 163
 Wedemeyer, L., 163
 Weinstein, Dr. A., 177
 Weizmann, Dr., 12
 Wenck, General, 71
 Westmoreland, General, 73
 Westphalia, Treaty of, 65
 Weygand, 26, 28
 Wheeler-Bennett, J. W., 59, 60
 White, Harry Dexter, 96-100, 102-5, 107-15,
 117-22, 124, 125, 127-34, 164, 168, 170-81
 Willoughby, 8, 155, 156-62, 166, 168
 Wilson, Woodrow, 12, 13, 18, 20, 21, 97
 Wlassoff, 64
 World Jewish Congress, 50, 51
 World Jewish Economic Federation, 22

 Yalta, 8, 48, 49, 66, 72, 75, 87-9, 94, 119, 120,
 124, 128, 168
 Yamashita, 66, 73, 74
 Yugoslavia, 78

 Zabrowsky; text of letters, 76-9; 80, 86, 87, 89
 Zionism, 11-17
 Zyromski, 24

LÉON DE PONCINS

**THE PROBLEM WITH THE JEWS
AT THE COUNCIL**

Translated from Italian by G. F. H.

**AAARGH
2008**

Translator's Suggestion

I suggest that those interested in this translation of Léon De Poncins' essay: *Il Problema degli Ebrei al Concilio* look also at another work, Maurice Pinay's *Complot Contra La Iglesia* (*The Plot Against the Church*) (available in English online at: <http://www.catholicvoice.co.uk/pinay/> and in the original Spanish at: http://ar.geocities.com/catolicosalerta01/complot_contra_la_iglesia). There are also German, French and Italian translations of this book, which seem not to be available online at this time. The French translation (two vol.) is available at Éditions Saint-Rémy, at editions.saint-remy@tiscali.fr

The following is an excerpt from the "Introduction to the Italian Edition" of Pinay's book.

The most infamous conspiracy is in progress against the Church. Her enemies are working to destroy the most holy traditions and thus to introduce dangerous and evil-intended reforms, such as those Calvin, Zwingli and other false teachers once attempted. They manifest a hypocritical zeal to modernise the Church and to adapt it to the present day situation, but in reality they conceal the secret intention of opening the gates to Communism, to hasten the collapse of the free world and to prepare the further destruction of Christianity. All this it is intended to put into effect at the coming Vatican Council. We have proofs of how everything is being planned in secret agreement with the leading forces of Communism, of world Freemasonry and of the secret power directing these. . . .

In addition, we have confirmation of what will still be unbelievable for those who are not initiated, namely that the anti-Christian forces have at their disposal, in the ranks of Church dignitaries, a veritable “Fifth Column” of agents who are the unconditional tools of Communism and of the secret power directing it. For it has been revealed that those cardinals, archbishops and bishops, who form a kind of progressive wing within the Council, will attempt to bring about a break through shameful reforms, whereby the good faith and the eagerness for progress of many devout Council Fathers will be deceived...

A further disastrous plan, which is being prepared, is that the Church shall contradict itself, so as a result to sacrifice its regard with the faithful; for later it will be broadcast that an institution which contradicts itself cannot be divine. With this proof they wish to desolate the Churches and achieve that the faithful lose their confidence in the clergy and abandon them.

It is intended to cause the Church to declare that what it has represented for centuries as bad, is now good. Among such manoeuvres spun for this purpose one particularly stands out on account of its importance, and refers in fact to the conduct of Holy Church towards the damned Jews, as Saint Augustine calls them; and this in reference both to those who nailed Christ to the cross, as also to their descendants, who are both archenemies of Christianity. The unanimous doctrine of the great Church Fathers, that “*unanimis consensus Patrum*” which the Church regards as a source of faith, condemned the unbelieving Jews and declared the struggle against them to be good and necessary.

For example, in this struggle, participated, as we will prove by means of irrefutable evidence, the following Saints: Saint Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, Saint Jerome, Saint Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, Saint John Chrysostom, Saint Athanasius, Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, Saint Basil, Saint Cyril of Alexandria, Saint Isidore of Seville, Saint Bernhard and even Tertullian as well as Origen, the latter two during the period of their indisputable orthodoxy. In addition, the Church fought energetically for nineteen centuries against the Jews, as we will likewise prove by means of reliable documents, and among which are found the following: Papal Bulls, Protocols of the Ecumenical and Provincial Councils as well as the highly renowned Fourth Lateran Council and many others, the teachings of Saint Thomas of Aquinas, of Duns Scotus and of the most important doctors of the Church. In addition we will quote Jewish sources of indisputable authenticity, like the official Encyclopaedias of Jewry, the works of famous rabbis as well as of the most well known Jewish historians.

The Jewish, Freemasonic and Communist plotters now have the intention at the coming Council of utilising, as they assert, the lack of knowledge of most clergy concerning the true history of the Church, to execute a surprise coup by adopting the standpoint at the assembled Holy Ecumenical Council that anti-Semitism must be condemned, as well as every struggle against the Jews who, as we will elaborate, are the wirepullers of Freemasonry and of international

Communism. They would like the infamous Jews, whom the Church has regarded as evil for the course of nineteen centuries, to be declared good and beloved of God. As a result the “*unanimis consensus Patrum*” would be contradicted, which laid down exactly the opposite, as well as what also found its expression through various Papal Bulls and Canons of Ecumenical as well as Provincial Councils.

Since the Jews and their accomplices pillory every struggle within the Catholic Church against the wickedness of the former, as well as the plots directed against Christ Our Lord, as antisemitism, we will likewise reveal in this book that Christ Himself, the Gospels and the Catholic Church can be included among the sources of antisemitism, since they campaigned for nearly two thousand years against those who denied their Messiah.

With the condemnation of Antisemitism, which at times is called Antisemitic racialism, it is wished to attain that his Holiness the Pope and the assembled Council in condemnation of Antisemitism experience the catastrophic event that the Church contradicts itself, and therefore, without giving account to this, silently also condemn Christ Our Lord Himself, as well as the Holy Gospels, the Church Fathers and most Popes, among them Gregory VII (Hildebrand), Innocent II, Innocent III, Pius V, and Leo XIII, who as we will show in this book, have fought bitterly against the Jews and the “Synagogue of Satan”.

G. F. H.

INDEX

Introduction

I. Nostra Ætate

II. Origin of the Reforms Proposed to the Council

III. Jules Isaac and Christian Teaching

IV. Jules Isaac and the Fathers of the Church

V. What Jules Isaac Demanded from the Council

VI. The “Judeo-Christian Friendship”

VII. Judaism’s Struggle against the Catholic Tradition

VIII. Only the Monotheism of Israel Is of Divine Essence

IX. Supposing that Jesus Christ Historically Existed

X. Israel and the Revolts of the Mind

XI. Jewish Imperialism

XII. The Divinity of Jesus Christ: Obstacle for Jewish Messianism

INTRODUCTION

One of the most disruptive changes in Catholic doctrine introduced by Vatican II is certainly the Church's teaching about the Jewish people. Up to forty years ago, in fact, all theologians, relying firmly on the Gospels, on the Fathers of the Church and on the ecclesiastical Magisterium of nearly 2,000 years believed that with the coming of Jesus Christ and the advent of the New Covenant sealed with His Blood, the **New Israel** of God is no longer the people of the Old Covenant, but all men called to be part of the Catholic Church through Baptism. It was also common opinion that the Jewish contemporaries of the Savior and those who lived subsequently (insofar as they "shared in" their forefathers' "crucifixion") were **deicides**, or that they were stained with the worst crime: **the murder of the Son of God and the rejection of His messiahship and divinity**. That was what all Catholics believed at least until 1965, when with the approval of the council's document *Nostra Aetate* a **new doctrine** was introduced according to which the Jews were in fact not responsible for the death of Jesus (unjustly attributed to the Romans, simple material executors of the crucifixion), and therefore had no longer to be considered as cursed by God for their enormous sin. Continuing along this line of thought and action one went even further and proclaimed that the Old Covenant between God and his people was still in force,¹ and thus maintained in fact that God had not rejected Israel because of its refusal of Christ and the salvation offered by Redemption which he accomplished on Calvary²; that **anti-Semitism** was a sentiment fed in the population from pre-council Christian teaching,³ and that such a sentiment had led to the fierce persecution of Jews put into action by Nazism and in the Holocaust, for which, therefore, the Church would be responsible. And thus it is that the highest representatives of the Bride of Christ, without blemish and without sin, prostrated themselves and asked forgiveness of Caiaphas' successors for the crime committed by "Christian peoples" (!?), fomented in their hatred toward the Jews by a "distorted" reading of the Evangelists and by the excessive enthusiasm of some Christian orators of the first centuries. In fact, this council document—one must read it to believe it—is not equipped with any notes, and that is because this far-fetched thesis, imposed on the faithful of the whole Catholic

¹ That the New Covenant replaces the Old, now devoid of any saving power and made useless by the sacrifice of Christ, Christians have sung this for centuries in the very beautiful Eucharistic hymn *Tantum Ergo*, in which in fact it is said that **"the figures of the Old Covenant yield to the truth of the new rite"** ("Et Antiquum documentum novo cedat ritui"). [*More accurately, "yield to the new rite." An asterisk * here and below marks notes by the translator.]

² However, about the rejection of Israel by God, the Gospel speaks a language that leaves no room for doubt: "Jesus issued a loud cry, and expired. **And behold the veil of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom**" (Matt. 27:50-51). The God of Israel has abandoned the Temple of Jerusalem in order to inhabit every soul in God's grace.

³ In fact, anti-Semitism had been condemned long before Vatican II. On March 21, 1928, at the end of a plenary meeting, the most Reverend Fathers of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office prepared a document that condemned "all feelings of hatred and animosity between peoples, and especially hatred against the people **at one time elected** by God, that hatred which today is vulgarly designated with the word 'anti-Semitism'" (cf. *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 1928, vol. II, pp. 171-172). [*However, cf. the Translator's Suggestion above for the opinion that anti-Semitism forms part of traditional Catholic teaching.]

world, rests on nothing! Not a single passage of Holy Scripture, not a single saint, not a single Pope—at least until 1962—has ever supported a similar theory. On the contrary, as results from a reading of this simple essay, all the Saints, all the Fathers of the Church and all the Popes have strongly reaffirmed the traditional doctrine. Nevertheless, except for a few voices out of the “politically incorrect” chorus which were hence immediately silenced, the Christian people, slowly poisoned with other new doctrines brought forth by the Council (Ecumenism, religious freedom, etc....), have passively accepted this *diktat* and have aligned themselves with the novelty. Notwithstanding every human calculation, every willingness to compromise and every plan for peace on earth, we believe that every betrayal of the Evangelical truth is a betrayal of the faith which we have received in baptism and which we want to keep intact until our death, even if this should entail the misunderstanding of our brothers and even persecution on the part of some of them, since we are certain that soon the Lord will restore the truth in its fullness.

I

NOSTRA AETATE

On November 20, 1964, the conference of bishops, archbishops and cardinals from all around the world, meeting in Council in Rome (3rd session), proposed a *schema*⁴ on the attitude and position of the Catholic Church concerning Jews and Judaism. Behind an innocent appearance of ecumenical unity, of Christian charity, of common spiritual affiliation and of the reconciliation of the churches, this *schema* presupposed a matter (*fatto*) of a serious consequences, since it implicitly asserted that for 2,000 years the Church was in error in this regard, and that it ought then to repair and completely revise its behavior toward the Jews. This objective satisfied the powerful propaganda in those years by the spokesman of the great international Jewish organizations (B'nai B'rith,⁵ the Jewish World Congress, etc....), which sought to obtain a “review and a purification” of the Christian teaching in respect to Judaism, propaganda which we will take up again shortly in what follows. This *schema* immediately aroused some violent reactions in the Muslim world and among Catholics of the Eastern Rite. John XXIII (1881-1963) thought that this matter, being of a very serious political and doctrinal import, required mature reflection. Therefore he refused to ratify it and postponed the decision to the next and final session of the Council, whose reopening was scheduled for September 14, 1965.⁶ I will now briefly summarize the facts, for it is necessary to know them in order to grasp the real significance of this problem, certainly one of the most serious treated by the Council. 99 council fathers voted “no,” 1651 “yes,” and 242 voted “yes,” but “with reservations.” The *schema*, on the other hand, was provisional; in the 4th session of 1965 the final ballot would take place. In the course of the general congregations, the Eastern Bishops intervened to say that they were against the very idea of the council’s making a declaration regarding the Jews. Here is an extract of the declaration *Nostra Aetate* concerning this issue, voted by the Council of the Fathers on November 20, 1964: “Since the spiritual heritage common to Christians and Jews is so great, this sacred council wants to foster and recommend a mutual understanding and respect among them, which

⁴ **Schema* can mean “outline,” “plan,” “project,” and also “scheme,” although it does not connote underhandedness or dishonesty as the English “scheme” frequently does.

⁵ “A Jewish fraternal association founded in the United States in 1843. In Hebrew ‘B’nai B’rith’ means ‘of the children.’ The purpose of this association is to maintain the Jewish tradition and culture and to fight against anti-Semitism[...]. The members are called ‘Brothers,’ and receive an initiation and meet in lodges” (cf. D. LIGOU, *Dictionnaire Universel de la Maçonnerie*, Ed. P.U.K., Evry 1987): “One can assume that the twelve founders of the ‘B’nai B’rith’ were already freemasons affiliated with the American Lodges, from the moment that they chose a ritual that is a mixture of the Rite of York and the American Rite of the ‘Odd Fellows’”(cf. *Tribune juive*, No. 997/1986; cit. in EPIPHANIUS, *Massoneria e sette segrete: la faccia occulta della Storia* (Freemasonry and Secret Societies: the Hidden Side of the Story), Trento s.d., pp. 478).

⁶ “I am the chief (*capo*)—John XXIII said to Prof. Jules Isaac with his friendly and somewhat irreverent language—but I have to consult the others, and see to it that the problems raised are studied by the offices. We are not here in an absolute monarchy” (see S. SCHMIDT S.J., *Agostino Bea, il Cardinale dell’unità*, Ed. Città Nuova, 1987, pp. 354). The *schema* was then finally voted on and ratified on October 28, 1965 within the confines (*ambito*) of the *Declaration Nostra Aetate, on the Church’s relations with non-Christian religions* (The Jewish religion, § 4).

is obtained above all through biblical and theological studies, and through a fraternal dialogue. And if Jewish authorities along with their followers did their best to achieve the death of Christ, nevertheless what was done during His passion cannot be charged either indiscriminately to all Jews then living, or to the Jews of our time. And if it is true that the Church is the new people of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected by God, nor as cursed, though that may seem to emerge from Sacred Scripture. Let all therefore take care that in the teaching and the preaching of the word of God one does not teach anything that does not comply with the truth of the Gospel and the Spirit of Christ. The Church, moreover, which detests all persecutions against any man, which is mindful of the patrimony that it has in common with the Jews, and which is not driven by political reasons but by the Gospel's spiritual love, regrets the hatred, the persecutions and all the manifestations of anti-Semitism directed against the Jews at any time and by anyone. In reality, Christ, as the Church maintains and has always maintained, by virtue of His immense love, voluntarily submitted to His Passion and death because of the sins of all mankind and in order that all people attain salvation. The duty of the Church, in its preaching, is therefore to announce the cross of Christ as the universal sign of love of God and as a source of every grace.”⁷ At first glance, this motion would seem consistent with the perennial doctrine of the Church, which, while trying to oversee the Christian community and to protect it from Jewish influences, has always condemned all persecutions. Even a Jewish writer in good faith like Max I. Dimont said: “If they had desired it, the Popes and the kings of the Middle Ages could have removed the Jews, but they did not do so. When for social, economic and religious reasons the presence of the Jews became undesirable, they chased them away without massacring them. The Church teaches that every human being has a soul, and that for a man a lifetime is not nearly enough to save his own. Only when religion lost all its influence on a people did it happen that a western people could coldly conceive the extermination of millions of human beings on the mere pretext that for them there was no space on earth.”⁸ In reality, the motion voted on in Rome demonstrated on the part of many Fathers a deep misunderstanding of Judaism. It seems that they were concerned with just the humanitarian problem, cleverly presented by the spokesman of the Jewish world and in a manner (*da una stampa*) inspired by Israeli elements.

⁷ Cf. *I documenti del Concilio Vaticano II (The documents of Vatican Council II)*, Ed. Paoline, Rome 1979, pp. 577-578.

⁸ Cf. M. I. DIMONT, *Les juifs, Dieu et l'Histoire* (“The Jews, God and History”), Ed. Robert Laffont, Paris 1964.

II

ORIGINS OF THE REFORMS PROPOSED TO THE COUNCIL

In fact, at the origin of the reforms proposed to the Council in order to change the conduct and the secular doctrine of the Church towards Judaism and to Freemasonry were several Jewish personalities and organizations: **Jules Isaac Marx** (1877-1963), **Label Katz**, President of B'nai B'rith, **Nahum Goldmann** (1895-1982), of the Jewish World Congress, etc. Among the above cited Jewish figures, there is one who played a preeminent role: the writer Jules Isaac, a Jew from Aix-en-Provence, a former General Inspector of French Education, author of classic texts and of *L'Histoire de France* (Ed. Malet-Isaac), and a member of B'nai B'rith. During the Council, where he found support among the progressive bishops, Jules Isaac was the principal theorist and promoter of the campaign against the traditional teaching of the Church concerning Judaism. We now see the position which he took to make prevail his thesis. After the loss of his wife and daughter, who died in a Nazi concentration camp, he spent the last twenty years of his life on the critical study of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, and devoted to this study two important books: *Jésus et Israël* (*Jesus and Israel*), published in 1946 and reprinted in 1959; *Genèse de l'antisémitisme* (*Genesis of Anti-Semitism*), published in 1948 and reprinted in 1956. Here is the crux of the thesis maintained by Isaac. It is necessary at last to bring an end to anti-Semitism, the result of which was the massacre of European Jews at Auschwitz and in other extermination camps during the Second World War. The “**Christian anti-Semitism**,” with its theological basis, is the most fearful anti-Semitism.⁹ Indeed, the attitude of Christians towards the Jews and Judaism has always been based on the story of the Passion which has been reported by the four Evangelists, and on the teaching which the Fathers of the Church have made: in particular, **St. John Chrysostom**, **St. Ambrose**, **St. Augustine**, **St. Gregory the Great**, **St. Agobard**, etc. Jules Isaac tried to demolish this fundamental theological basis by challenging the **historical value** of the evangelical accounts and by discrediting the arguments advanced by the Fathers of the Church to protect it from the influence of the Jews, who were accused of feeding subversive intentions against the Christian order.¹⁰ Immediately after

⁹ That this corresponds to the thinking of many Jews, we conclude from an anecdote: in 1938, Austria was annexed to Hitler's Germany. The Jew **Sigmund Freud** (1856-1939), who in those days was in Vienna, was urged by one of his close collaborators to leave the city in order to avoid capture by the Nazis. The father of psychoanalysis responded with these words “The Nazis, I do not fear them. **The enemy is religion, the Catholic Church**” (see E. INNOCENTI, *Critica alla psicoanalisi*, Sacra Fraternitas Aurigarum in Urbe, Rome, 1988, 115 pages).

¹⁰ For further confirmation, here is a short excerpt from an article published in February 1936 in the London magazine *Catholic Gazette*, which contains some excerpts of conversations of Parisian Jews in the course of secret meetings: “We have already done most of our work, but we cannot say that we have reached the goal of our operation (*opera*). We still have a long way to go **before being able to overthrow our main enemy: the Catholic Church**. We must keep well in mind that the Catholic Church is the only institution that is set to block our route and will remain so for however long its existence will last. The Catholic Church, with its methodical work and its educational and moral teachings, forms in its own children such a mindset that will keep them too proud of themselves to submit to our domination and to

the war, he began to organize meetings with national and international philo-semitic Catholic personalities favorable to his thesis. In 1947,¹¹ after meetings of this kind between Jews and Catholics, in which on the part of the Jews there figured persons such as **Edmond Fleg** (1874-1963) and **Samy Lattés**, and on the part of the Catholics philo-semites such as **Henri Irénée Marrou** (1904-1977), **Father Jean-Guinolé-Marie Daniélou** (1905-1974), appointed Cardinal after the Council by Paul VI in 1969 (N.d.R.), and **Father Vieillard**, a member of the Episcopal Secretariat. Isaac edited a report, consisting of eighteen points, on the “*Revision of Christian Teaching with regard to Israel*.” In the same year, he was invited to the International Conference of Seelisberg, in Switzerland, in which seventy people coming from nineteen different countries participated, among whom were **Father Callixte Lopinot**, **Father Démann**, **Pastor Freudenberg** and the **Grand Rabbi Jacob Kaplan** (1895-1994). The conference adopted in plenary session the “Ten Points of Seelisberg,” which proposed to the Christian churches the measures necessary to take to amend the religious teaching in respect to the Jews. Later, with the Grand Rabbi of France, with the Jews Edmond Fleg and **Léon Algazi**, and some Catholic friends such as Henri Marou, **Jacques Madaule**, **Jacques Nantet**, as well as other Protestant friends such as Professor **Lovsky** and **Jacques Martin**, he founded the first Amitié Judéo-Chrétienne (“Judeo-Christian Friendship”), which was followed soon by the foundation of other “Amitiés” at Aix, Marseille, Nîmes, Montpellier, Lyon, and finally at Lille, where he obtained the protection of **Cardinal Achille Liénart** (1884-1973).¹² Later, he also founded other similar associations in Northern Africa. In 1949, he entered into relationship with some members of the clergy of Rome who saw to it that he be received in private audience by Pope Pius XII (1875-1958), before whom he pled the cause of Judaism, specifically asking him to take into consideration the “Ten points of Seelisberg.” In 1959, Jules Isaac held a conference at the Sorbonne on the necessary revision of Christian teaching in respect to the Jews, that ended with an appeal for justice and love for the truth to John XXIII. Shortly thereafter, he met with many prelates of the Roman Curia, especially **Cardinal Eugene-Gabriel-Gervais-Laurent Tisserant** (1884-1972), with **Cardinal André-Damien-Ferdinand Jullien** (1882-1965), with **Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani** (1890-1979), with **Cardinal Augustin Bea** (see the juxtaposed photo; 1881-1968),¹³ and

kneel at the feet of the future King of Israel.” Shortly thereafter, the Parisian weekly *Le réveil du peuple* reported that these statements were made during a meeting of the Masonic Order B’nai B’rith (cf. *Chiesa viva*, n° 178, October 1987, p.16).

¹¹ All the information that follows has been extracted from statements by this same Isaac.

¹² According to some authors, Cardinal Liénart was enrolled in the Masonry of Luciferine Rite (*Massoneria di Rito Luciferino*).

¹³ “But who was the Cardinal Agostino Bea? Many have pointed to Jewish origins [...]. A German Jesuit, formerly confessor of Pius XII and a friend of John XXIII, Bea was professor of Sacred Scripture and rector from 1930 to 1940 of the Pontifical Biblical Institute. His close ties with the high Jewish Freemasonry are known and documented: like his meeting with the president of the ‘B’nai B’rith’ Label Katz which took place on February 16, 1963 in Rome [...] But Bea was also in touch with the Grand Master of the United Lodges of Germany, Pinkerneil” (see EPIPHANIUS, op. cit., p. 488). About his Jewish origins, we note that “in recent centuries there are in Germany and Austria different personalities who bear the surname ‘Beha,’ phonetic equivalent of the Sephardic surname ‘Beja,’ which their Sephardic ancestors brought into Spain where they lived. But Cardinal Bea was not the only crypto-Jew in the Vatican; besides him there worked actively other so-called Jewish converts like Monsignori John Oesterreicher and the Augustinian Gregory Baum, who joined the Bishops Kempe, auxiliary of the Diocese of Linburg

on June 13, 1960 he was received by John XXIII, from whom he asked condemnation of the “contempt” and advised the creation of a subcommittee charged with the study of this problem. Later, Jules Isaac “*had the joy of knowing that his proposals had been taken into consideration by the Pope and had been transmitted for study to Cardinal Bea,*” who then created, within the Secretariat for the Unity of Christians, a group of experts specifically charged with examining the relations between the Church and Israel. In 1964, the matter was submitted to the Council, which led at last to the vote on November 20, 1964.

(Germany) and Sergio Mendez Arceo, Bishop of Cuernavaca, Mexico (Mendez is a typical Hispanic-Jewish surname; he was descended from Sephardics who tried to judaize the Mexican population of Cotija)” (cf. *Chiesa viva*, n° 179, November 1987, pp. 16-17).

III

JULES ISAAC AND CHRISTIAN TEACHING

Jules Isaac has devoted two books to criticizing and breaking down the two pillars of Christian teaching in regard to Judaism. In the first of these two works—*Jésus et Israël*—published in 1949 (596 pages), and reprinted in 1959,¹⁴ Jules Isaac criticizes the Evangelists, and especially St. John and St. Matthew. “The historian has the right and the duty—the absolute duty—to consider the evangelical accounts as **factional testimonies** (against the Jews), with this aggravating circumstance that they are the only witnesses and all four go in the same direction; we have neither Jewish testimonies (of a certain value) nor pagan testimonies to compare with the first and wherewith to refute them. Now, in no other document is the partiality (*il partito preso*) of the Evangelists more evident and more accentuated; however, in no other case is the absence of non-Christian documents more regrettable than it is for everything regarding the story of the Passion [...]. However, it is clear that all four Evangelists have had the same concern, that is, to minimize Roman responsibilities, in order to augment those of the Jews... On the other hand, this partiality takes different shades: Matthew far exceeds not only Mark and Luke, but maybe even John. Is it any wonder? Brothers, if enemies, are the most relentless [enemies]; now, Matthew is Jewish, fundamentally Jewish, the most Jewish of the Evangelists. According to a tradition that seems well founded, he wrote “in Palestine and for the Palestinians,” to demonstrate, in reference to the Old Testament, that Jesus Christ really was the Messiah foretold by Scripture [...]. But has all this been historically proven? **It is licit to doubt it.** It is not in fact surprising to note that of the three synoptics the most partial is Matthew, and that his account of the Passion is the most **tendentious**; for the moment, the **most impartial**—or the least impartial—is Luke, the only non-Jewish Evangelist, the only one from the “Gentiles.”¹⁵ The Christian accusation against Israel, the accusation of deicide, an accusation of a crime—which is itself criminal—is the most serious, the most **harmful** and the most **iniquitous**. Jesus Christ was sentenced to the torture (*supplizio*) of the Cross, a Roman torture, by Pontius Pilate, a Roman procurator [...]. But the four Evangelists, unanimous on this point, affirm that Jesus Christ was delivered into the hands of the Romans by the Jews; only because of irresistible pressure from the Jews did Pilate, eager to present Jesus as innocent, condemn him to torture. So, not on the Romans, simple executors, but on the Jews lies the responsibility for the crime; this weighs upon them, with a supernatural weight which crushes them [...]. Only Matthew (27: 24-25) knows and says that the prosecutor Pilate washed his hands, according to Jewish custom, to rid himself of responsibility for the innocent blood which he was forced to shed. Only Matthew also notes that “all the people” exclaimed: “Let His blood fall on us and on our children.” Mark, Luke and John know nothing, and say nothing, about the washing of the hands or the terrible exclamation. This verse, **which has caused so much harm**, and which has been exploited to the detriment of the Jewish people for so many centuries and by so many Christian authors, is only in the Gospel of

¹⁴ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël*, Nouvelle Edition Paris, Fasquelle 1959.

¹⁵ *“Per il momento, il **più imparziale** - o il meno imparziale - è Luca”

Matthew, which makes it close then to the apocryphal gospels, and not corresponding at all to historical truth.¹⁶ In brief: in the story of the Passion revised and corrected by Jules Isaac, the Evangelists appear as **arrant liars**, of whom the most poisonous is without a doubt Matthew. “To him the palm for having launched with his hand the poisoned dart that cannot be extracted.”¹⁷ Jules Isaac peremptorily concludes by saying: “Never does the **tendentious** nature of a story, never its concern ‘to make a point’ appear with greater obviousness, an obviousness that bursts forth and culminates in these verses (24-25), generating conviction in every free spirit. **No, Pilate did not wash his hands according to the Jewish custom.** No, Pilate did not display his innocence. **No, the Jewish crowd did not exclaim: ‘Let his blood fall on us and on our children’[...].** Why persist further? The reason is clear. It is for all people of good faith. I would say: it is also before God himself.”¹⁸

¹⁶ Cf. J. ISAAC, *L’enseignement du mépris* (“The Teaching of Contempt”), p.141

¹⁷ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël*, p. 483.

¹⁸ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël*, p. 493.

IV

JULES ISAAC AND THE CHURCH FATHERS

In the second of these works—*Genèse de l'antisémitisme*—published in 1956, Jules Isaac strove to discredit the Fathers of the Church. It is impossible to summarize in a few words a volume of 350 pages. Let us limit ourselves to mentioning some of its most characteristic passages: “It is true that in the pagan world there was a strong current of anti-Semitism, much earlier than Christian anti-Semitism; it is equally true that this anti-Semitism has at times sparked bloody conflicts or ‘pogroms.’ Just as there was a pagan anti-Semitism, whose origin dates back to the divine commandment, in what would Christianity find its justification for having inherited it (after having been itself a victim of it for a long time), and even more, after having pushed to paroxysm its **virulence, malignity, calumnies** and **mortal hatreds**? Against Judaism and its followers, no weapon has been more fearful than the ‘teaching of contempt,’ especially inculcated by the Fathers of the Church of the fourth century; and in this teaching no thesis was more harmful than the ‘deicide people.’ The Christian mentality is still steeped in the depths of its subconscious [...]. To fail to recognize this and not to stress it is equivalent to ignoring or disguising the largest source of Christian anti-Semitism.”¹⁹ “This is the great source whence Christian sentiments are fed without certainly being the origin of them.”²⁰ The ‘teaching of contempt’ is a theological creation.”²¹ “We hear emerge for the first time throughout the centuries, like a dull noise, the chorus of accusations, Christian imprecations—permit me to say—spoken by those who are Christians only in name, because these do not accord with the words of charity, of mercy and of brotherly love, which are the fundamental teachings and the glory of Jesus Christ. ‘Deicide’: this is the accusation launched unreservedly and without any distinction against the whole Jewish people.”²² “The blind violence of the ignorant masses is intimately linked to the cold

¹⁹ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, Ed. Calmann-Lévy, Paris 1956, p. 327.

²⁰ *My translation of this sentence assumes *originarla* in the Italian text is a misprint for *originarli*.

²¹ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, Ed. Calmann-Lévy, Paris 1956, p. 327.

²² Here are some extracts from the writings of the Church Fathers regarding the deicide and Jewish hatred towards Christ and Christians: **St. Justin** (100-165) writes: “You have killed the Just and before him his prophets, and now you reject perfidiously those who hope in him and in him who has sent him, God Almighty and the author of the universe; you dishonor them as much as you can and in your synagogues you raise up imprecations against those who believe in Christ, because you do not have the power put your hands on us, thanks to those who now govern us, but whenever you could, you did” (cf. *Dialogue with Trypho*, 16.4; PG 6, 511); **Origen** (185-253) thought that the Hebrew people as such had committed “the greatest of crimes” (see *Contra Celsum*, IV, 32; PG 11.1087), that of killing the Son of God. **St. Ambrose** (339-397) spoke of the Jews as a “parricide people” and loaded them with all the responsibility for the death of Jesus: “He (Jesus) was killed by the whole people of the Jews, and they persecute him still with their hatred” (cf. Psal. 39.14; PL 14, 1062); **St. Cyril of Alexandria** (370-444) speaks of the Jews [who had] become “Lord-killers” (“kyrioktoni”), and before him **St. Gregory of Nazianzus** (329-390), who accuses the Jews of having killed Christ “with deicide hands” (“chersi taïs theoktonis”) (see PG 37.466). According to **St. Cyril of Jerusalem** (387), “Israel has crucified the Son of the (heavenly) Father and has thrown him out of the vineyard” (cf. *Cath.* XI); **Theodoret of Cyr** writes: “Up to today, Jews still execrate the Savior” (in Psal. 109, 28).

science of the theologians. A fundamental accusation to which is linked the theme of capital punishment, of the terrible curse that rests on the shoulders of Israel, explaining (and justifying in advance) its unfortunate fate, its most cruel trials, the worst violence committed against it, torrents of blood flowing continually from its open and living wounds [...]. So that through a skilful manipulation, alternately, of doctrinal judgments and popular anger one makes fall back on God what, when viewed from the terrestrial sphere, is without doubt the result of human wickedness, this perversity, skilfully exploited in different ways from century to century, from generation to generation, and which culminated in Auschwitz, in the gas chambers and crematory ovens of Nazi Germany.²³ “We must acknowledge with sadness: almost all the Fathers of the Church took part, each with his own stone, in these feats of **moral lapidation** (not without material consequences): St. Hilary of Poitiers (315-367) and St. Jerome (347-420), St. Efrem (306-373) and St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Ambrose and St. Epiphanius (315-403), a Jew by birth, and St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and I say no more. But in this illustrious court, venerable from other points of view, two names, among all, have the right to a special mention: the medieval sculptural allegory exalts (*raffigurando*)²⁴ the Greek orator St. John Chrysostom (Greek for ‘mouth of gold’; N.d.R.) for the abundance and ferocity of his invectives, and for the overflowing of insults; and the great doctor of Latinity, St. Augustine, for his wonderful and (perilous) ingenuity in the development of a coherent doctrine.”²⁵ After this global overview of the Church Fathers,²⁶ we shall now proceed to the individual cases, citing some passages of the study which Jules Isaac devoted to the great Doctors: St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great and St. Agobard.

St. John Chrysostom

In 386, St. John Chrysostom (345-407) began to preach at Antioch, where there was a Jewish community. He first produced eight homilies against the Jews, whose tone “is often of an unheard-of violence. Therein are gathered together all the prejudices and all the insults.”²⁷ In him is more apparent than in others, together with a vehemence and sometimes with a measure of incomparable **coarseness**, this fusion of elements tainted with the popular anti-Semitic vein and with the prejudices of clear theological origin, by

²³ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël*, p. 351.

²⁴ *The Italian text reads: “l’allegoria scultorea medievale raffigurando l’oratore greco San Giovanni Crisostomo (dal greco “bocca d’oro”; N.d.R.) per l’abbondanza e la ferocia delle invettive, e per lo straripamento degli oltraggi; e il gran dottore della latinità, Sant’Agostino.” I am unsure of the meaning of *raffigurando* which I have translated as “exalts.” I do not know to what “medieval sculptural allegory” Isaac has in mind.

²⁵ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, p. 161.

²⁶ St. Gregory of Nyssa apostrophizes the Jews thus: “Murderers of the Lord, murderers of the prophets, enemies of God, men who hate God, adversaries of grace, advocates of the devil, race of vipers, descendants of the Pharisees, synagogue of Satan, sinners, perverse men, stoners, enemies of all probity”(cf. *Oratio in resurrectionem Christi*).

²⁷ According to St. John Chrysostom, the Jews, after the death of Jesus, gave themselves over to committing the greatest evils and therefore “God hates them” (in the sense that he hates the evil they commit). With him, St. Atanasio (295-373), another Father of the Church, says that “the Jews are not the people of the Lord, but the heads of Sodom and Gomorrah” (cf. *De Incarnatione*, 40, 7).

means of the use of the biblical texts, the ultimate feature of Christian anti-Semitism.²⁸ “We say now: whatever was the purpose he pursued, this excess in outrage and slander is revolting in a sacred orator. These seeds of contempt and hatred are forever sprouting. Nice work, beautiful harvest; beyond the holy rhetoricians of the fourth century, piously working to drag their enemies into the mud, I see emerge in future centuries the countless legion of theologians, of Christian preachers, of teachers and writers, intent to embroider on the impressive themes of the carnal Jew, of the lecherous Jew, of the greedy Jew, the demonic Jew, the cursed Jew, the Jew the killer of prophets, the killer of Christ, the deicide; and they conscientiously applied themselves, in good faith, to make these dangerous, deadly and false notions penetrate into receptive minds; they were ready also—a logical consequence—to admit, with Chrysostom, that if the odious Jew had inherited exile, desperation, slavery, misery and shame, this is just (the justice of God); he has repaid for his misdeeds.” “Today, at a distance of about one thousand six hundred years, if you want a clear conscience, you must convince yourself that one is dealing here with figures of speech; and so be it, but “we must understand” where the figures of speech lead which were introduced by the “Golden Mouth” and taken up through the centuries, as by a chorus, by myriads of disciples. The rhetorical figures have taken on a vital and virulent consistency and have become encrusted in millions of souls. Who would dare believe that the Christian soul is free of them today? Who can say if it will ever be free of them? And after the Christian preachers, see, come the shameful slanderers, the “Streicher Nazis.”²⁹

St. Augustine

Jules Isaac writes that St. Augustine (354-430) is less violent than the Greek orator. “(This Father of the Church) is not less passionately hostile to Judaism and the Jews; he is no less concerned to combat their persistent influence in order to preserve the faithful, and to forearm them with a complex of valid arguments in view of disputes with these stubborn men, these reprobates. The method is the same; very similar are the points of view and the interpretations of Sacred Scripture well before the coming of the Savior. Judaism is gradually corrupted, desiccated, made stale; after the revelation of Christ, it has no other inspirer than Satan. Those who once were the privileged children of God, now have become the children of the devil.”³⁰ **“In this passionate teaching that has defied the centuries and still today dares to raise its voice, there is no more respect for biblical truth than for historical truth.”** One does not fear to make oneself a cruelly sharp soul in order the better to strike to death the old Israel by making use of the regrettable crucifixion and the diaspora.”³¹ “I have not yet said the essential thing, St. Augustine’s own doctrinal contribution, [something] characteristic of his spirit, that is, the elaboration of an ingenious, opportune thesis, and therefore destined to a greater

²⁸ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël*, p. 256.

²⁹ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, pp. 162-164, 165-166. Isaac refers to **Julius Streicher** (1885-1946), a teacher in Nuremberg appointed by the Führer, in 1925 to be *Gauleiter* of Franconia, who conducted for two decades a very ferocious anti-Semitic campaign that ended with his hanging at the Nuremberg trial on October 16, 1946.

³⁰ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, p.166.

³¹ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, p.167.

(theological) fortune: the doctrine of the ‘witness people’ [...]. If, in spite of everything, there are still Jews who have refused to believe in Christ, it is because it is necessary that they exist; because God wanted thus in his supernatural wisdom, to testify, to testify to the Christian truth. In fact, they prove it through their sacred books, along with their diaspora [...]. Right now, we see the radical difference that distinguishes the Christian system of debasement from its **modern imitator, the Nazi system; blind and ignorant** are those who do not recognize their profound bonds! Nazism was a stage, a short stage that preceded the mass extermination; that other, in contrast, entailed (*implicava*) survival, but a shameful survival in contempt and decadence. It was therefore made to last, to harm, and slowly to torture millions of innocent victims.”³²

St. Gregory the Great and St. Agobard

“We consider now the Church’s teaching in the high Middle Age. There cannot be found such a perfect expression of it except in the masterpiece of St. Gregory the Great (540-604), who lived between St. Augustine and St. Agobard, at the end of the fourth century. After the Fathers of the Church, no work has been more echoed and more welcome, especially in Christianity and Catholicism in the West. No example can be more convincing, because we know already, by having seen him act as head of the Church and as head of the State, that, far from being a fanatic, this great Pope is immortalized for outstanding qualities: generosity of heart, moral elevation, fairness and humanity. Drunk with pride, the Jews have put all their energy to close their intelligence to the word of God’s messengers. By losing humility, they have lost the understanding (*intellegenza*) of truth.” This is the theme of the carnal people, closely connected to the previous theme (of Judaism degraded by the coming of Christ).³³ “Imitating the fourth Evangelist, St. Gregory continually abuses the word “Jews” by using it to describe the party of the opponents of Jesus Christ, and that means dooming the entire Jewish people to the contempt and hatred of the faithful: “The Jews have delivered the Lord and have accused him [...]. Not even the best examples were sufficient to lead this rough nation to serve God out of love, and not fear [...]. It was faithful only to the letter of the divine precepts [...], and sought in the divine words not a means of sanctification, but an occasion for pride.”³⁴ “The theme of the ‘carnal people’ is infinitely dangerous, because it leads with a fatal crescendo to the people of the “Beast,” of the “Antichrist,” and of the “devil,” inspired by a perverse, diabolical hatred against God and his defenders.”³⁵ “Such are the teachings of the Great Pope, for him purely doctrinal, and in practice reconcilable with the humanitarian duties of Christian charity and respect for legality. For him, but not necessarily for others [...]. The mediocre minds and hearts, always and everywhere in the majority, drew necessarily from this teaching a horror for the ignominy carved on the brow of the Jewish people: their crimes, their curse, and their satanic perversion. You do not need others, in this era and in every era, to unleash the barbarity of the ‘Beast.’”³⁶ “I will not omit to say and repeat where such a teaching leads when launched with great

³² Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, pp. 168, 172, 267, 289.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, p. 289.

³⁵ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, p. 290.

³⁶ Ibid.

velocity among the ranks of the **ignorant and cruel** faithful; it is not just a matter of 'unjust acts of violence' which they condemned, with their lips, but a matter of the most despicable consequences of crimes, of murder, of genocide, of great massacres, or monstrous 'pogroms.'"³⁷ "It's too simple to believe, or to let it be believed, that the worst acts of verbal violence are harmless, as if they did not risk generating the worst acts of actual violence. Between the mouth which outrages and the arm which strikes, which is the more culpable? Let us therefore leave St. Agobard, in spite of the apologists, his part and the weight of his responsibility."³⁸ "And so, by a methodical infiltration, a Christian man, who is not an angel, is irresistibly led to dream of punishment, vengeance and blood. If the occasion comes, whether it be the crusade, the plague or famine, or held back anger, accumulated in the bottom of hearts, easily reinforced in the popular belief by absurd calumnies inherited from paganism (the accusation of ritual homicide), the anger explodes, and there is always some fuse to set it off, and there follows the thousand and one "pogroms" of the Middle Ages, which pious eloquence and theological knowledge will know how to elevate to the plan for "providential punishment" and "divine vengeance."³⁹ "To maintain the contrary requires an inveterate and lunatic partiality, or blind obedience to a tradition, which in any case, as we know, is not 'normative,' [and] which should not then be imposed as a rule of thought even on the most docile son of the Church."⁴⁰ In reality, it is a matter of a lively tradition, **infinitely harmful**, of a **criminal tradition** of which I have already spoken, and which leads—I repeat it—to Auschwitz and other places where six million Jews were murdered just because Jews!" [...] This is a disgrace not only to the German people, but to Christianity. Without centuries of Christian catechesis, preaching and **vituperation**, the Hitlerian catechesis, propaganda and vituperation would have been impossible."⁴¹ "How can we forget that Christianity, especially from the XIth Century onwards, has practiced against the Jews a policy of debasement and 'pogroms' which has lasted, among some Christian nations, up to the contemporary era, of which we still see today the survival in very Catholic Poland, and of which the Hitlerian system is nothing more than an atrociously perfected copy? Until the Christian churches and peoples will have recognized their initial responsibilities, and until they will have the keen desire to retract them, anti-Semitism will retain its virulence. Not long ago the Archbishop of York noted that there exists in Great Britain a latent anti-Semitism which is spreading everywhere, and the contrary would be really surprising, as the permanent source of this latent anti-Semitism consists of Christian religious teaching in all its forms."⁴²

³⁷ "Pogrom" is a Russian word that means "destruction." It was a matter of popular uprisings with massacres and looting against Jewish minorities accused of usury, fraud, ritual murders, frequent especially in Central and Eastern Europe in the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century.

³⁸ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l'Antisémitisme*, p. 285.

³⁹ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël*, pp. 365-508.

⁴⁰ "Per sostenere il contrario, si richiede un inveterato e forsennato partito preso, o la sottomissione cieca ad una tradizione che tuttavia, come si sa, non è "normativa," che non dovrebbe dunque imporsi come regola di pensiero nemmeno al figlio più docile della Chiesa." The purport and logic of this sentence are to me inscrutable.

⁴¹ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël*, pp. 365-508.

⁴² Cf. J. ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël*, p. 572.

V

WHAT JULES ISAAC DEMANDED FROM THE COUNCIL

After reading the books by Jules Isaac, **Josué Jéhouda**, **Rabi**, **Elijah Benamozegh** (1822-1900), **Albert Memmi** and other contemporary Jewish authors, one understands very well the maneuver and trap set for the councilar Fathers. “**The Church**, writes Jules Isaac, **is the only culpable party; the Jews are completely innocent**, free from any responsibility, which falls thence uniquely on the Church, whose teaching is the inexhaustible source of anti-Semitism, the same anti-Semitism that has fermented throughout the centuries until it led to the cursed place: Auschwitz. Only the Church, therefore, must make an **act of reparation amending and rectifying its millenary teaching.**” Following these remonstrances, Jules Isaac passed on to the practical realizations. He asked, or rather demanded, from the Council the following assurances:

- The condemnation and the elimination of all racial, religious or national discrimination against the Jews;
- The modification or deletion of liturgical prayers regarding the Jews, and in particular those of Good Friday;
- The assertion that Jews are not responsible for the Death of Christ, for which the responsibility falls on humanity;
- The removal or annulment of those Evangelical passages which mention the crucial episode of the Passion, and in particular that of St. Matthew whom Jules Isaac coldly treats as a liar and falsifier;
- That the Church confess to shoulder all the wrongs that for two thousand years persist in a state of latent war between Jews and Christians and other men;
- The promise that the Church would assume in the future, in a definitive way, an attitude of humility, contrition and forgiveness toward the Israelites, or, finally, that it would make every effort to repair the wrong it caused, by amending and rectifying its traditional teaching according to his directives.

VI

THE “JUDEO-CHRISTIAN FRIENDSHIP”

Despite the insolence of his *ultimatum*, and despite his virulent indictment against the Gospels and the teaching of the Fathers of the Church—which finds its foundation in the very words of Christ—Jules Isaac met right in Rome, among modern prelates, powerful support, starting with the many followers of the “Judeo-Christian Friendship.” In the edition of January 23, 1965, the weekly [newspaper] *Terre de Provence* (*Land of Provence*), published in Aix, published a report of a talk given by **Msgr. Robert de Provenchères**, Archbishop of that diocese, about the “Judeo-Christian Friendship” at the inauguration of the “Avenue Jules Isaac,” an event which had taken place that same morning. The article in question began in these terms: “A dense crowd was stuffed into the Ziromski amphitheater to hear the talk which Msgr. De Provenchères was about to give, as part of the ‘Judeo-Christian Friendship’ on the following theme: ‘The Councilar Decree on the relations between Catholics and non-Catholics.’ ‘The Deacon Palanque first of all recalled the moving ceremony which had taken place that morning at ‘Mount Saint-Eutrope’ in the presence of the mayor, Mr. Mouret, Mr. Schouraki and Mr. Armand Lunel, President of the Friends of Jules Isaac. At this meeting, which focused on the councilar *schema* of the 3rd session of the Council, the figure of Jules Isaac was once again recalled. Msgr. De Provenchères presented a first hand documentation, having himself participated in the Council. Later, expressing our gratitude for his geste (*gesto*), one gave him the floor. Msgr. De Provenchères revealed how happy he was the evening of that memorable day of celebration to give his testimony, because the councilar work had procured him great joy. Speaking of Jules Isaac, he said that since their first meeting, in 1945, he held him in profound esteem, a respectful esteem that soon became tinged with affection.⁴³ The Councilar *schema* seemed to be the solemn ratification of that which was their conversation. The origin of this *schema* was due to a request by Jules Isaac to the Vatican, examined by more than 2,000 bishops. This initiative was taken by a layman and a secular Jew. Msgr. De Provenchères observed then that great historical acts (*atti*) often begin from some deeds (*fatti*) and become consecrated subsequently. So [...] the meeting of Jules Isaac with John XXIII was the sign of the nascent Judeo-Christian friendship. [...] Msgr. De Provenchères made afterwards a detailed report of the role played by Jules Isaac in Rome in the preparation for the Council. Then, Dean Palanque, thanking Msgr. De Provenchères, noted the role that the bishop of Aix had played for the successful path of this *Schema*.”⁴⁴ And since in this chapter we are treating the “Judeo-Christian Friendship,” it is very interesting to see with what haughty and contemptuous

⁴³ *My understanding of this passage is as follows: Msgr. De Provenchères first gives a formal informative talk about the Council (not about Isaac). This is the planned talk that everyone came to hear. Then, the others, in gratitude to him either for this talk or for his having participated in the Council (it is unclear to what *gesto* refers), ask him to give another talk (unplanned and less formal) about the Council; and it is in this second talk that “the figure of Jules Isaac” appears.

⁴⁴ Cf. *Terre de Provence*, on January 23, 1965.

irony Josué Jèhouda, one of the spiritual leaders of contemporary Judaism speaks of it:⁴⁵ “The current expression ‘Judeo-Christian,’ which points to the Jewish origin of Christianity, has even falsified the course of universal history because of the confusion which it provokes in minds. Abolishing in fact the fundamental distinctions between Jewish messianism and the Christian one, it joins together two radically contrasting notions. Putting emphasis exclusively on ‘Christian’ to the detriment of ‘Judeo,’ it makes disappear the Monotheistic messianism, a valid doctrine on all levels of thought, and reduces it to a purely confessional Messianism, preoccupied like Christian messianism with the salvation of the individual soul. The term ‘Judeo-Christian,’ though it designates a common origin, is without doubt **the most lethal concept**. It is in fact based on a ‘contradiction in the adjective’ (*contradictio in adjecto*) and has also falsified the course of history. It unifies, in a single expression, **two irreconcilable concepts**, and wants to demonstrate that there is no difference between day and night, between hot and cold, or between black and white; it therefore contains a ruinous confusion on which, however, you are trying to build a civilization. Christianity offers the world a **limited messianism** [...]; Even Spinoza, the thinker farthest from the historic monotheism of Israel, writes: ‘Regardless of what some churches say about the assumption of human nature on the part of God, I confess that theirs is an absurd language, like that of those who affirm that a circle is covered by [or: dressed in] the nature of a square.’⁴⁶ The dogmatic exclusivity that Christianity professes must finally stop [...] **Christian stubbornness** claims to be the sole heir of Israel and propagates anti-Semitism. This scandal sooner or later must end; first there will disappear and end the climate of lies in which Anti-Semitism is enveloped.”⁴⁷ This is called speaking clearly; but let us continue: “**Christianity is based on a faith which has emerged from a myth** which is tied to Jewish history, and [which is] not [tied] to a precise tradition transmitted by written and oral Laws, as is the case for Israel.”⁴⁸ “Christianity yet claims to bring into the world the ‘true’ messianism which seeks to convert all pagans, Jews included. But as long as the monotheistic messianism of Israel lasts, even to the virtual state (*anche allo stato virtuale*), the Christian messianism is presented as that which it actually is, that is, an **imitation** disappears in the light of authentic messianism.”⁴⁹ It seems that Christians have given evidence of a certain **naïveté** while throwing themselves with enthusiasm into the trap of “Judeo-Christian Friendship,” but we fear that in this case, once again, they have not been entirely innocent victims of Talmudic duplicity. When Jules Isaac and the other leaders of Judaism came to Rome, they were urged not to recall these passages found in their writings; they spoke of Christian charity, ecumenical unity, of common biblical affiliation, of the “Judeo-Christian Friendship,” of the fight against racism and of the martyrdom of the Israelite people. They had won the game since the 1,651 bishops, cardinals, archbishops and

⁴⁵ Cf. J. JÈHOUDA, *L'antisémitisme, miroir du monde* (“Anti-Semitism, mirror of the world”), Ed. Synthésis, Geneva 1958.

⁴⁶ It is no coincidence that Jèhouda cites in its favor the Jewish philosopher **Baruch Spinoza** (1632-1677), whose relations with the Jewish Cábala, and the consequent continuous return to cabalistic teaching in his theses, are known to all the scholars of this special area (cf. for example, J. MEINVIELLE, *Influsso dello gnosticismo ebraico in ambiente cristiano* (*Influence of Jewish Gnosticism in Christian Environment*), Sacra Fraternitas Aurigarum in Urbe, Rome 1988, pp. 184-189).

⁴⁷ Cf. J. JÈHOUDA, op. cit., pp. 135-136.

⁴⁸ Cf. J. JÈHOUDA, op. cit., p. 132.

⁴⁹ Cf. J. JÈHOUDA, op. cit., p. 155.

councilar fathers approved the reform of the Catholic teaching according to the directives of Jules Isaac. The leaders of Jewish organizations did not tell the Pope and the Bishops: “Your Evangelists are patented liars. Your Fathers of the Church are counterfeiters and unjust because they spread worldwide hatred against Jews and have unleashed the barbarism of the ‘Beast.’ They were the precursors of Hitler and Streicher, and are therefore the true [persons] responsible for Auschwitz and the six million Jewish victims of Nazism.” These accusations can be read clearly in the books by Jules Isaac, books that are for sale in all the bookstores, but, as it seems, the Councilar Fathers did not read them, as they have never read the books of Jéhouda, Benamozegh, Rabi, Memmi and so many others. No, Isaac and the heads of the major Jewish organizations did not say with Josué Jéhouda, one of the masters of contemporary Jewish thought: “Your monotheism is a **false monotheism, a bastard and falsified imitation of the only true monotheism**, the Jewish one, and if Christianity does not return to Jewish sources, it is condemned without remedy.” They did not say with the glory of contemporary Jewish thought, the rabbi of Livorno, Elijah Benamozegh: “**The Christian religion is just a false religion calling itself divine**. For it and the world there is no other way of salvation than to return to Israel.”⁵⁰ They did not say with Memmi: “**For Jews, your religion is a blasphemy and a subversion. For us, your God is the devil, that is, the essence (*concentrato*) of evil on earth.**”⁵¹ They did not say with Rabi “Conversion of the Jew to Christianity is tantamount to **treason** and to **idolatry** because it implies the **great blasphemy**, that is, the belief in the **divinity of a man.**”⁵² They were very skilful not to frighten Rome by clearly expressing their thought, and succeeded in having on their side a certain number of prelates. All this is a rather unusual story. How is it possible that several progressive bishops who, in their opposition to traditional Catholicism (qualified as “fundamentalism” [*integrisimo*]), have come to avail themselves of all weapons, including those poisoned by Jewish hatred against Christians? Nevertheless, one can rightly maintain that they constitute a minority. But then, how do you explain the success of the Jews in this quandary? It owes its good fortune to the two following reasons:

The majority of the councilar Fathers did not know the role played by Jewish organizations and Jules Isaac in the preparation of the *Schema*; they, moreover, had never read the works of the latter.⁵³

Taken as a whole, the councilar Fathers understood poorly (*conoscevano male*) the Jewish question, and easily let themselves be fooled by the Jewish disquisitions, very

⁵⁰ Cf. E. BENAMOZEGH, *Israël et l'Humanité*, Ed. Albin Michel, Paris 1961; the first edition of this goes back to 1914.

⁵¹ Cf. A. MEMMI, *Portrait d'un juif* (“Portrait of a Jew”), Ed. Gallimard, Paris 1962.

⁵² Cf. RABI, *Anatomie du judaïsme français* (“Anatomy of French Judaism”), Les Editions de Minuit, Paris 1962.

⁵³ *However, copies (in Italian or Spanish) of the book *Plot Against the Church* (*Complot Contra La Iglesia*) were, “following the first Italian edition, distributed in the Fall of 1962 among the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council.” So we are told in the first paragraph of the “Introduction to the Spanish Edition” of this book; the same point is made in the last paragraph of the “Introduction to the Italian Edition.” Cf. <http://www.catholicvoice.co.uk/pinay>.

ably presented with subtle and fearsome (*sottili e temibili*) “arguments” of the kind made by Jules Isaac.⁵⁴

However it happened, the maneuver was conducted with great skill, and succeeded. The vote confirms this: 1,651 Fathers believed that the story of the Passion, in the version of Jules Isaac, was to be preferred to that of St. John and St. Matthew. These 1,651 bishops, archbishops and cardinals admitted that the teaching St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great, St. Ambrose and St. Agobard had to be amended and adjusted according to the orders to Jules Isaac, about whom the Jewish writer Rabi recently said: his book *Jesus and Israel* has been “a successful weapon of war against that particularly harmful Christian teaching,”⁵⁵ namely, the codified teaching by the above mentioned Fathers of the Church. By changing the liturgy of Good Friday and eliminating, among other things, the prayer of *improperi*, these 1,651 bishops gave support to Jules Isaac, who, when speaking of this prayer, said: “It is not easy to say what in it is the most striking, its beauty or its iniquity.”⁵⁶ Apparently, the bishops believed that the iniquity of this prayer exceeds its beauty.⁵⁷ In short, the vote on November 20, 1964, behind the **appearance of Christian charity**, of reconciliation of Churches and of **ecumenical unity**, is another step on the path of **yielding**, of **abandonment of traditional Christianity**, and of the **return to Judaism**.

⁵⁴ *For such a “subtle and fearsome” argument by someone other than Isaac, cf. “Rabbi Heschel sent a statement to the Vatican stating, in part, ‘Since this present draft document calls for “reciprocal understanding and appreciation, to be attained by theological study and fraternal discussion,” between Jews and Catholics, it must be stated that spiritual fratricide is hardly a means for the attainment of “fraternal discussion” or “reciprocal understanding.” A message that regards the Jew as a candidate for conversion and proclaims the destiny of Judaism is to disappear will be abhorred by Jews all over the world and is bound to foster reciprocal distrust as well as bitterness and resentment.’ Heschel concluded with these now-famous words, ‘**As I have repeatedly stated to leading personalities of the Vatican, I am ready to go to Auschwitz any time, if faced with the alternative of conversion or death.**’”

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nostra_Aetate#_note-3

⁵⁵ Cf. RABI, op. cit.

⁵⁶ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, p. 309.

⁵⁷ Here is the text of the incriminated Holy Friday prayer, eliminated from the Roman Missal by John XXIII: “We pray also for the perfidious Jews, in order that the Lord our God remove the veil from their hearts, so that they too with us recognize our Lord Jesus Christ”; one should note that etymologically the term “perfidious” (from Latin *pérfidis*) means “without faith,” and therefore, far from being an offensive word, it corresponds well to the Catholic doctrine expressed in this beautiful prayer. The same fate has befallen the prayer in the Preface of the Mass of the Third Sunday of Lent according to the Ambrosian rite: “Oh, how perfidious and stubborn is the evil race (*stirpe*) of the Jews, who boast of their carnal descent at the same time as they refuse to recognize the Father who is in heaven. O ungrateful people, many times already hit by exemplary punishments, who disdain the Father when present without knowing how to keep the absent [Father] (*che disdegna il Padre presente senza saper conservare l’assente*). It is quite just that we exult loudly, for having obtained the place and the kingdom of the Jews, thanks to Christ, our Lord.”

VII

JUDAISM'S STRUGGLE AGAINST THE CATHOLIC TRADITION

In fact, behind the appearance of an ecumenical search for a reconciliation between religions and other equally seductive words, it was a matter of demolishing the bulwark of Catholic Tradition, defined by Josué Jéhouda as “the ancient fortress of **Christian obscurantism**.” According Jéhouda, there were three attempts at the “straightening out of Christianity,” which “sought to cleanse the Christian conscience of the miasmata of hatred”; three attempts at the straightening out (*raddrizzamento*) of Christian theology which had become suffocating and paralyzing; “three open breaches in the old fortress of Christian obscurantism.” In fact, three important stages in the destruction of traditional Christianity:

- **The Renaissance;**
- **The Protestant Reformation;**
- **The French Revolution.**

In these three major movements, Jéhouda perceives the wonderful work of dechristianization to which each of them, in various forms, has powerfully contributed. He does not tell us this so brutally, since he is very skilful at handling the artifices of language, but that bursts forth clearly from his writings, as we will show with some quotes extracted from his works: “The Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution represent the three attempts at straightening out the Christian mentality to put it in tune (*mettersi al diapason*) with the progressive development of reason and science, and while dogmatic Christianity continued to make itself obscure, the Jews were gradually emancipating themselves.” Speaking of the Renaissance, he maintains: “We can affirm that if the Renaissance had not deviated from its original course to the detriment of the dualized Greek world (*a svantaggio del mondo greco dualizzato*), we would have had without a doubt a world unified by the creative thought and doctrine of the Kabbalah.”⁵⁸ We shall now proceed to the Reformation: “With the Reformation, which exploded in Germany fifty years after the end of the Renaissance, the universality of the Church was destroyed. Before Luther and Calvin, John Reuchlin,⁵⁹ a

⁵⁸ Cf. J. JÉHOUDA, op. cit., p.168. [*I interpret this statement to mean that originally the Renaissance was inclined to reject the Greek and Catholic duality of (mortal) body and (eternal) soul, but later “deviated” from this line of thought and adopted this same duality. Cf. Section X below where Elie Faure expresses the Jews’ desire to destroy “the Classical Greco-Latin and Catholic edifice.”]

⁵⁹ “With John Reuchlin, the humanist of Pforzheim (nephew of Melancthon, and a partner of Luther in the Protestant Reformation), the struggle for the introduction of the ‘Cabala’ into Christianity gains strength. (He) made use of his knowledge of Hebrew, as a key that helped him to enter the wonderful world of cabalistic science. [...] Reuchlin published two books: ‘De verbo mirifico’ (‘On the Miraculous Word’) and ‘De arte cabalistica’ (‘On the Cabalistic Art’). [...] Rightly fearing a new prevalence of Judaism, the Dominican Santiago Hochstratten, professor of theology and researcher (*inquisitore*) in Cologne, took on the job of refuting John Reuchlin in his destruction of the ‘Càbala.’ In it, he proved that the cabalistic

disciple of Pico della Mirandola, shook the Christian conscience by maintaining from 1494 on that nothing was greater than the Jewish wisdom [...]. With the return to ancient sources, Reuchlin advocated also the return to Jewish sources. Finally, he had taken revenge on the convert Joan Pfefferkorn, who was calling loudly for the destruction of all 'Talmuds' existing in circulation. The new spirit that was to revolutionize the whole of Europe [...] appeared with regard to Jews and the 'Talmud' [...]. However, not without surprise, we found among the protestants as many anti-Semites as among Catholics." In short, Jéhouda concludes, "the Reformation was the revolt against the Catholic Church, which itself is already a revolt against the religion of Israel."⁶⁰ Speaking of the French Revolution, Jéhouda affirmed: "The third attempt at the straightening out of the Christian position is accomplished after the failure at unification of Christianity through reform, it was driven by the French Revolution [...], which marked the beginning of atheism in the history of Christian peoples. This Revolution, having assumed a quite anti-religious attitude, extended into Russian Communism, and contributed powerfully to the dechristianization of Europe."⁶¹ And to crown this straightening out of the Christian mentality, there came **Karl Marx** (1818-1883) and **Friedrich Nietzsche** (1844-1900). "In the nineteenth century, two new attempts to make healthy (*risanare*) the mentality of the Christian world were made, respectively, by Marx and Nietzsche."⁶² In truth, "the deep sense of history is the same in every age, and it's a struggle, tough and open (*sorda e aperta*)"⁶³ between the forces working for the progress of humanity and the forces that cling to crystallized values, obstinately trying to maintain what exists to the detriment of what must yet come [into being]."⁶⁴ For Jewish thinkers, the councilar reform was supposed to constitute a new stage on the road to the abandonment, the **yielding** and the **destruction of the Catholic Tradition** (*Tradizionale cattolica*),⁶⁵ emptied little by little of its substance.

doctrine was not in fact supportive of Christian dogmas, but rather denied them, and that Reuchlin's books were teeming with erroneous propositions" (cf. J. MEINVIELLE, *op. cit.*, pp.164-165).

⁶⁰ Cf. J. JÉHOUDA, *op. cit.*, pp.169-172.

⁶¹ Cf. J. JÉHOUDA, *op. cit.*, pp.170-172.

⁶² Cf. J. JÉHOUDA, *op. cit.*, p.187. The real name of the Jew Marx was **Mordekkai Levi**.

⁶³ **sorda e aperta* The basic meaning of the adjective *sordo* is "deaf"; but it also carries several other senses ("dull" and "muted" of sounds; "insensible" and "indifferent" of people; "secret" and "hidden" of anger; "prolonged but not intense" of suffering), none of which seems to me particularly appropriate to juxtapose in this context with *aperto* ("open"). The translation "tough" is my best guess.

⁶⁴ Cf. J. JÉHOUDA, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

⁶⁵ *I take "*Tradizionale*" in the Italian text as a misprint for "*Tradizione*."

VIII

ONLY THE MONOTHEISM OF ISRAEL IS OF DIVINE ESSENCE

Actually, it was a matter of a new episode and a new battle with the context of the millennial Judeo-Christian clash. Here's how Jéhouda, Rabi, Benamozegh and Memmi depict for us this clash: "Christianity—Jéhouda tells us—stubbornly refuses to consider Israel as its father on the spiritual level [...]. To believe that Christianity is the 'fulfilment' (*pienezza*) of Judaism, that it is its culminating point, or that Judaism has been completed by Christianity is (*significa*) to corrupt in the root (*in radice*) universal monotheism [...]. Now is the time when it will be necessary to effect the indispensable purification of the Christian conscience by means of the doctrine of Jewish universal monotheism."⁶⁶ "Christian anti-Semitism, while calling itself messianic, claims to replace the messianism of Israel with the faith in a crucified God who assures to every faithful personal salvation. Abasing Jewish messianism by putting it at the level of paganism, Christianity aims to convert all Jews to a **reduced messianism** [...]. But as long as the monotheistic messianism of Israel shall last, even only in a virtual mode, the Christian one will always appear as what it is: **an imitation tottering in the light of authentic messianism** [...], and anti-Semitism will continue as long as Christianity refuses to face its true problem, which is due to the **betrayal of monotheistic messianism**."⁶⁷ "Christian stubbornness claims to be the sole heir of Israel and advocates anti-Semitism. Sooner or later this scandal must end; first there will end and disappear the climate of lies which surrounds anti-Semitism."⁶⁸ Let us hear now Elijah Benamozegh, one of the masters of contemporary Jewish thought: "If Christianity agrees to revise its thought about Judaism, it (*esso* = Judaism) will always be the true religion of the Gentiles."⁶⁹ "The religion of the future must be based on some positive or traditional religion, wrapped in the mysterious prestige of antiquity. Now, among all the ancient religions, Judaism is the only one that claims to possess the religious ideal for the whole of humanity, because the work of Christianity is nothing but a copy which must be put before the original (*una copia che dev'essere posta davanti all'originale*) [...]. As it is the uncontested Mother, it is the more ancient religion which will become the newest [...] in front of Christianity [...] **with its claimed divine origin and its infallibility** [...]. To replace an authority which declares itself infallible and which is born only in year one of the Christian era or of the Muslim Hegira [...], we must find another **much more serious** infallibility which, beginning with the history of man on earth, will end with him."⁷⁰ "The dreamed-of reconciliation among the first Christians, as a precondition for the Parusia or the final advent of Jesus Christ, the return of the Jews into the Church, without which—all the different Christian denominations are in agreement on this—the work of Redemption remains incomplete, this return, we say, will be effected, as has been expected, but in the

⁶⁶ Cf. J. JÉHOUDA, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.

⁶⁷ Cf. J. JÉHOUDA, *op. cit.*, pp. 154-160.

⁶⁸ Cf. J. JÉHOUDA, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

⁶⁹ Cf. E. BENAMOZEGH, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁷⁰ Cf. E. BENAMOZEGH, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35.

only serious, logical and sustainable way and above all in the only way profitable for mankind. The unification of Judaism and the religions that have emerged from it will be realized, and, according to the words of the last of the Prophets, seal of Veggenti—as the doctors call Malachi—there will take place the cordial return of the children to their Father.’⁷¹

⁷¹ Cf.. E. BENAMOZEGH, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

IX

SUPPOSING THAT JESUS CHRIST HISTORICALLY EXISTED

Let us now pass on to Rabi: “Among Jews and Christians—Rabi said—there is an insurmountable divergence. It concerns Jesus. **Assuming that he historically existed, for the Jew he is neither God nor the son of God.** At most, you might say, as a last concession, the theory of Joseph Klausner: **neither Messiah**, nor prophet, nor legislator, nor founder of a religion, nor Tanna⁷² nor Pharisean rabbi; for the Jewish nation, Jesus is a great moralist and an artist in parables [...]. The day in which it will be freed from the tales of the miracles and from mysticism, Jesus Christ’s book of morals (the Gospel; N.d.R.) will be one of the most precious gems of Jewish literature of all time.”⁷³ “Sometimes, I happened to imagine, in the last century, the last living Jew on his feet in front of his Creator, as is written in the ‘Talmud’; the Jew, bound by oath, remains on his feet all the way from the Sinai. I imagine therefore this last Israelite who will have survived the outrages of history and the attractions of the world. What he will say to justify his resistance to the attritions of time and the pressure of men? I hear him; he says: **‘I do not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ.’** It is logical that this profession of faith be scandalous for a Christian. But is the profession of faith by Christians not perhaps scandalous for us Jews? For us [...] the conversion to Christianity entails the **greatest blasphemy**, namely, the belief in the divinity of a man.”⁷⁴ These writings are relatively recent. We return now to two thousand years ago and re-read the story of the Passion: “Then those, who had arrested Jesus, led him to the high priest Caiaphas, where were already assembled the scribes and the elders [...]. The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin sought false testimony against Jesus, to put him to death; but they did not succeed in finding any, although they had made in advance many false witnesses. Finally, two of these presented themselves and said: ‘He declared: “I can destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days.”’ And the high priest arose and said: ‘You answer nothing? What is this that they testify against you?’ But Jesus was silent. Then the high priest said to him: ‘I beseech you, by the living God, that you tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God.’ ‘You have said it,’ Jesus replied, ‘I indeed say to you: henceforth you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of God and come on the clouds of heaven.’ Then the high priest tore his clothes, saying, ‘He has blasphemed! Why do we still need witnesses? Now you have heard the blasphemy; what think ye?’ ‘He is guilty to

⁷² *The *tannaim* (Hebrew: תנאים, singular תנא, *tanna*) were the *Rabbinic* sages whose views are recorded in the *Mishnah*, from approx. 70-200 CE. The period of the *Tannaim*, also referred to as the Mishnaic period, lasted about 130 years. It came after the period of the *Zugot* (“pairs”), and was immediately followed by the period of the *Amoraim*.

The root *tanna* (תנא) is the *Talmudic Aramaic* equivalent for the *Hebrew* root *shanah* (שנה), which also is the root-word of *Mishnah*. The verb *shanah* (שנה) literally means “to repeat [what one was taught]” and is used to mean “to learn.” (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tannaim>)

⁷³ Cf. RAB, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

⁷⁴ Cf. RAB, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

death!’”⁷⁵ (Matt. 26:57-66). After two thousand years, mutual positions remain unchanged, and the Judeo-Christian clash remains irreducible.

⁷⁵ This is how St. Luke describes the same incident: “Hardly had the day begun when the council of the elders of the people met with the chief priests and scribes; they led him before the Sanhedrin and said to him: ‘Are you the Christ, tell us.’ Jesus replied: ‘Even if I tell you, you will not believe me; if I ask you questions, you will not answer me. But from this moment on the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the power of God.’ They all said, ‘You are then the Son of God.’ And he said to them: ‘You say it yourselves: I am he.’ They answered: ‘What need do we still have of testimony? We have heard it ourselves from his mouth’” (Luke 22:67-71). St. Mark’s account is much more similar to that of St. Matthew.

X

ISRAEL AND THE REVOLTS OF THE MIND⁷⁶

The Jewish antagonism has been manifested in a continuous—even if underhanded—manner in the two thousand year course of the Judeo-Christian clash. “The Jew—**James Darmesterer** tells us—was the champion of reason against the mythical mind; in the intellectual night of the Middle Ages, only in it did he think that he could find asylum. Provoked by the Church which wants to persuade him, after having tried in vain to convert him by force, he undermines with irony and perspicacity some of her controversies, and, like no one else, knows how to find the vulnerabilities of her doctrine. The understanding of the Sacred Books, and even more the terrible sagacity of the oppressed, are his means to discover those points. He is the doctor of the incredulous; all the revolts of the mind are presented to him in the shade or under an open sky. He worked in the immense forge of curses of the great Emperor Frederick and of the princes of Swabia or Aragon; he fashions together this deadly arsenal of reasoning and irony that he offered then to the skeptical of the Renaissance and the libertines of the Seventeenth Century. And the sarcasm of Voltaire is none other than the heavy echo of a word murmured six centuries earlier, in the shade of the ghetto, or, even earlier, (in the Counter-Gospel of the I and II Century) at the time of Celsus and Origen, and at the very origins of the religion of Christ.”⁷⁷ For his part, **Elie Faure** (1873-1937), whose works were recently reprinted and highly publicized, talks about “this sarcastic snickering (Heine, Offenbach) towards all that is not Jewish [...]. His ruthless analysis and his irresistible sarcasm acted as vitriol.” Following the course of our history, “it is easy to follow the trail, and although it is not possible to quantify the dissemination of Jewish thought, after its passage we can take note of its destructive power. **Sigmund Freud, Albert Einstein, Marcel Proust, Charlie Chaplin** opened up to us, in all senses, the prodigious streets which demolish the narrow lanes (*strettoie*) of the Classic Greco-Latin and Catholic edifice in which for five or six centuries the burning doubt of the Jewish soul was waiting for opportunities to destroy it. For it is necessary to note that its [sc. that of the Jewish soul] own skeptical pole appears to emerge for the first time from the complete silence that surrounds the action of the Jewish mind in the Middle Ages, silence in the middle of which, from the Renaissance onwards, some voices burst forth, and which [sc. silence] today is annihilated by a great din.” Yes, “is it possible to consider the Jew as anything other than a demolisher armed with corrosive doubts who, since the times of the Greeks, has always opposed Israel to the sentimental idealism of Europe? [...] His historic mission is clearly defined, and perhaps forever. It will be the main factor of each apocalyptic period, as it was at the end of the ancient world, and as it will be at the end of the Christian world in which we live.”⁷⁸

⁷⁶ *“Israele e le Rivolte dello Spirito”; *spirito* can of course mean “spirit” as well as “mind.”

⁷⁷ Cf J. DARMESTERER, cited in A. SPIRE, *Quelques juifs* (“Some Jews”), Ed. B. Grasset, Paris 1928.

⁷⁸ Cf. E. FAURE, *L’ame juive* (“The Jewish soul”); cited in *La question juive vue par vingt-six éminentes Personnalités juives* (“The Jewish question as seen by twenty-six prominent Jewish Personalities”), Ed. EIF, Paris 1934.

XI

JEWISH IMPERIALISM

Citizens of the proud British Empire, at that time at the height of its power, who on the morning of February 9, 1923 read the newspapers, certainly did not give any attention to a few lines appearing in the Hebrew weekly *Jewish World*, fearsome lines because prophetic for those who knew how to grasp their meaning. The *Jewish World* said: “The dispersion of the Jews has not made them a cosmopolitan people. In fact, this [sc. the Jews] is the only truly cosmopolitan people, and, as such, it must act—and in reality it does act—as a **dissolver** of any distinction of race and of nationality. The great ideal of Judaism is not that one day Jews will gather in a corner of the earth for separatist purposes, but that **the entire world will be imbued with Jewish teaching**, and then in an universal brotherhood of nations—in reality, a vaster Judaism—all the separate races and religions will disappear. They [...] go even further. With their literary and scientific activities, with their supremacy in all sectors of public activity, they are preparing to gradually melt (or merge: *fondere*) thoughts and systems which are non-Jewish or which do not correspond to the Jewish models (*stampi*).”⁷⁹ “Already on the horizon burns the dawn of the ‘Our Day,’” wrote one of their modern prophets amazed by the vision of their near triumph.⁸⁰ The messianic dream can take many different forms, but the final goal remains unchanged: **the triumph of Judaism, Jewish law and the Jewish people**. Under the universalist appearance, it is, indeed, a matter of Jewish imperialism which intends to govern and enslave the world. Elie Faure writes: “The Jewish people, right from the time of Jesus Christ—**still not accepted by his people**—believed itself the people chosen as an instrument of a higher power. With respect to other nations, it still today believes itself the chosen people because representative of a supernatural force. [...] **For it the beyond there** [sc. the afterlife] **does not exist**. However often it has been spoken about, Israel has never believed in it. The pact of alliance is only a bilateral contract quite precise and positive. If the Jew obeys, he does so only in order to have dominion over the world.[...] Israel is a terrible realist: it wants recompense down here on the earth for those who do good and punishment for those who live in evil [...]. Even in the darkest moments of their history—and of universal history—these eternal losers (*vinti*) preserve in their faithful hearts the promise of an eternal victory.”⁸¹

⁷⁹ Cf. *Jewish World*, February 9, 1923. At the *British Museum*, I was able to verify personally the correctness of this citation (N.d.A.).

⁸⁰ Cf. A. NOSSIG, *Integrales Judentum*, Ed. Renaissance-Verlag, Berlin 1922.

⁸¹ Cf. E. FAURE, *art. cit.*

XII

THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST: OBSTACLE FOR JEWISH MESSIANISM

But to achieve this goal, **it is necessary to abolish Christianity**, which represents an insurmountable obstacle on the path to Jewish imperialism. Until the coming of Jesus Christ, the position of Israel was simple and clear: according to the Prophets, by the grace of Yahweh, Israel was called upon to govern the world; if the people of the servants of Israel had complied with the divine requirements, the time would have come when Israel would have reigned over all the earth. But here unexpectedly in Galilee was born a Prophet: A Prophet—Man and God—even He from the real race of David, and thence son of the Covenant. “Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets, I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them” (Matt. 5:17). And as proof of his mission, he performed a series of unprecedented miracles; the fascinated crowds follow him...

But—in this is the enormous gravity of his mission—he interprets the promise in a completely new and different sense, so as to destroy the proud Hebrew edifice by spiritualizing and universalizing it. The realization of the promises was transferred from the material to the spiritual plane; surpassing the national level, it was no longer solely addressed to the Jews, until that moment the only beneficiaries, but was extended to the entire world... It was no more a matter of the supremacy of a race or a nation, or the triumph of a privileged nation: the chosen people were reduced to the rank of an ordinary people, one people among others.

The religious pride and nationalism of the Jews did not permit this leveling; it was contrary to the messianic promises, and put off irremediably the moment of the submission of all the kingdoms of the earth to Israel. The heads of the priests and the Pharisees could not tolerate such a blasphemy and such an attack on their privileges, and thus to get rid of that dangerous agitator, delivered him to the Romans and had him condemned to death. But Jesus Christ rose from the dead and His preaching spread in the ancient world with the speed of flame. Jews denounced His disciples to the Roman authorities as rebels against the empire; Rome persecuted them incessantly, offering them as food to wild beasts, burning, skinning and crucifying them. Nevertheless, the Christian wave proceeded without respite, winning over the senior imperial power; then suddenly the world wavered and inclined in favor of the Church of Christ. On October 28 of the year 312, the battle of Ponte Milvio took place, just outside of Rome, which saw **Constantine** against **Maxentius**; the former was the winner, while the latter drowned in the waters of the Tiber. “One battle was enough to change the organization of the world and its religious outlook (*l’assetto del mondo e l’aspetto religioso*)... Constantine’s victory is rightly seen as the starting point of a new era, that of the Christian Empire... Starting from that moment, for reasons that have not yet been fully clarified, the winner—Constantine—tied his destiny to that of the Church of Christ. A great and surprising revolution, deplored by some and exalted by others, it remains one of the most important of human history; the reign of Constantine is only the prelude to a phenomenon

that continues and is completed during the chaotic and extraordinary period which was the fourth century. But the unheard-of luck of the Church had to entail the ruin of the synagogue. For this reason, the fourth century was a fatal epoch that resulted in a future of anguish, grief and disaster.”⁸² The Israelites have never accepted and will never accept this defeat. The rupture was total and definitive; the collision now became inevitable (*irriducibile*) on both sides. “If the Jew is right, Christianity is nothing but an illusion. If instead the Christian is right, the Jew is, under the best of hypotheses, an anachronism or at most the image of that which no longer has reason to exist. For the Jew, Christianity represents the renunciation of a monopoly, and the rejection of a “nationalist interpretation”—**not to say racist**—of the “election”; it [sc. Christianity] is the opening up to the human brotherhood, and, at the same time, a big “amen” said to God, and to everything God decides: it is the acceptance of suffering and death, the renunciation of the proud I [...]. As far as I know, Christianity has never submitted any other people to so difficult a test. Because for no other people has the transition to Christianity meant, in the more or less long term, its expiration as such. For no other people were the traditions, which would have to be abandoned in order to embrace the faith in Christ, so intimately tied to all the manifestations of belonging to a nationality. And here we touch on the other reason (or excuse), which justifies the Jew’s ‘no’ to Christ, who did not correspond to the idea that the Jew had made for himself of the Messiah and of salvation.”⁸³ Pretending to be the true ‘Israel’—Israel according to the spirit and not according to the despicable flesh—Christian theology wants to replace Israel permanently. Too bad, however, that Israel has not disappeared and will not disappear.”⁸⁴ “Christianity is concerned essentially with the salvation of every individual person. Judaism aims instead at the salvation of the house of Israel, the only one that can permit the salvation of the seventy nations of the universe.”⁸⁵ “Israel appears (*si presenta*) in history as a peculiar (*particolare*) people because it is simultaneously religion and nation, without any possibility of separating these two factors, something possible for all other peoples. Without a doubt, Israel is also a race, not in the biological sense, as racism has alleged, but in the ethical sense (*senso etico*) of history.”⁸⁶ “The way in which the Christian faith has gained its independence, had to quickly and inevitably drag it into a war against Israel ‘according to the flesh,’ since the Church proclaims itself the only Israel and the only Israel according to the spirit. But is the full gravity of this claim well grasped? It is worse than the defamation of the Jewish people, and means trying to take from them the very spark of life and the sacred fire, and even their very soul. Moreover, it means to remove Israel from its place in the sun and take from it its privileged status in the empire, because such are the close ties and the interweaving of the spiritual and temporal.”⁸⁷ We then return to the same point: to overthrow the Christian religion, born from her womb (lit. breast), is a vital necessity for Israel, which views it as her most formidable opponent; Jules Isaac repeats this continually in his writings. The next passage, an extract from one of his relatively recent works, well shows the state of mind of most contemporary Jewish

⁸² Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, pp. 155-156.

⁸³ Cf. F. FEJTO, *Dieu et son juif* (“God and his Jew”), pp. 34-190-192.

⁸⁴ Cf. J. JÉHOUDA, *op. cit.*

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.


⁸⁷ Cf. J. ISAAC, *Genèse de l’Antisémitisme*, p. 150.

youth: “We live enthusiastically awaiting new and unprecedented times, and we believe we see already precursory signs: **the agony definitely started by the religions, the families and the nations. We nourish only anger, irony and contempt for the laggards of history who take root in these residues [...]** Alas! Whether it is that we are completely wrong or that we have returned afterwards, in a period of reflux,⁸⁸ or that I have simply gotten old, I see myself forced to admit that these residues had the tenacity of couch grass and have persisted to remain as deep structures of the life of the peoples and their collective being [...]. Apparently, we were condemned, and for a long time, to accept the religions and the nations. Again, I do not judge, but I limit myself to observe.”⁸⁹ In his book *Le malheur d’Israël* (*The Misfortune of Israel*), the Jewish writer **A. Roudinesco** provides a wonderful response to all these curses filled with anger: “Survival down to our days of this small community, despite persecution and unprecedented suffering, has been called the ‘Jewish miracle.’ This survival is not a miracle, but rather is **a disgrace. The real Jewish miracle is the spiritual conquest of humanity through Christianity. The mission of the chosen people ended a long time ago.** Those who, among the Jews, hope one day to be able to complete Christianity with a renewed messianism ignore the essential laws of the evolution of humanity.”⁹⁰

⁸⁸ * “o che siamo rientrati dopo, in un periodo di riflusso.”

⁸⁹ Cf. A. MEMMI, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

⁹⁰ Cf. A. ROUDINESCO, *Le malheur d’Israël* (“The Misfortune of Israel”), Ed. de Cluny, Paris 1956.



THE OCCULT WAR ★ ★

LÉON DE PONCINS & EMMANUEL MALYNSKI

The Occult War

THE OCCULT WAR

THE JUDEO-MASONIC PLAN TO CONQUER THE WORLD

COUNT LÉON DE PONCINS

&

EMMANUEL MALYNSKI

THE OCCULT WAR: THE JUDEO-MASONIC PLAN TO CONQUER THE WORLD

Original editions: *La Guerre occulte: Juifs et Francs-Maçons à la conquête du monde* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils, 1936) and *La guerra occulta: armi e fasi dell'attacco ebraico-massonico alla tradizione europea* (Milan: Hoepli, 1939)

Authors: Count Léon de Poncins, Emmanuel Malynski, & Julius Evola

Translator: S K

Editor: John B Morgan

Copyright © 2015 Logik Förlag

Box 22120, 250 23 Helsingborg, Sweden

www.logik.se

ISBN: 978-91-87339-34-9

Contents

[Editor's Note](#)

[Preface](#)

[Introduction](#)

[The Nineteenth Century: The Revolution Awakens](#)

[The Holy Alliance: Metternich, Champion of the Counter-Revolution](#)

[The Holy Alliance: Nationalism and Universalism](#)

[1848: The Beginning of the World Revolution](#)

[Napoleon III: An Ally of World Subversion](#)

[The First Wars for Democracy: The Crimean War](#)

[After Bringing Russia Down, the Revolution Directs Its Efforts against Austria](#)

[Bismarck and the Transformation of Central Europe](#)

[The Commune and the Eternal Hatred](#)

[1914-1918: The Great War](#)

[1919: The Peace Treaties – The Disruption of Europe and the League of Nations](#)

[The Birth Pangs of Bolshevism: The Rise of Capitalism in Russia](#)

[Stolypin's Economic Reform](#)

[Stolypin's Work: Capitalism and Property](#)

[Stolypin and the Jewish Question](#)

[The Revolution of March 1917](#)

[From Kerensky to Lenin](#)

[Lenin](#)

[The *Coup d'Etat* of November 1917: The Triumph of Bolshevism](#)

[Europe Strikes Back](#)

[APPENDIX I: Considerations On The Occult War](#)

[APPENDIX II: Review of Emmanuel Malynski and Léon De Poncins' book *The Occult War*](#)

Editor's Note

The original edition of *La Guerre occulte: Juifs et Francs-Maçons à la conquête du monde* (The Occult War: The Judeo-Masonic Plan to Conquer the World) was published in French by Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils in Paris in 1936. The Italian traditionalist philosopher Julius Evola translated the book into Italian, and published it with Hoepli in Milan in 1939 under the title of *La guerra occulta: armi e fasi dell'attacco ebraico-massonico alla tradizione europea* (The Occult War: The Weapons and Phases of the Jewish-Masonic Attack on the European Tradition), adding his own Introduction. We have based our translation on both editions, including Evola's Introduction as well.

During the process of translating the book, we discovered that Evola made a number of interesting alterations to the text, occasionally adding, removing, or rewriting small parts of the French original. We have noted these changes in the footnotes, as they offer an insight into the different ways in which de Poncins and Evola approached the same issues. We have likewise added two appendices: Evola's essay 'Considerations on the Occult War', which is a 1938 essay on this topic; and a review of the French edition of the book that was published by the first traditionalist philosopher, René Guénon, in 1936.

Both versions of the text contained their own footnotes. Following each note, I have added either 'Poncins' or 'Evola' to indicate whose footnote it is, and those which were added by me for the present edition are denoted with an '—Ed.'. Where sources in other languages have been cited, I have attempted to replace them with existing English-language editions.

John B Morgan

PREFACE

Emmanuel Malynski spent thirty years of his life directly observing the development of the modern revolutionary movement around the world, devoting an almost visionary intelligence and clear-mindedness to this task.

Born in Russian Poland in an age in which the social organisation was still largely feudal, he witnessed the birth and rise of industrial capitalism, paving the way to Bolshevism. In practical terms, he lived through several centuries of history, since this development first began in our lands during the Renaissance, only to reach its flowering after the French Revolution.

He directly experienced the collapse of Tsarism and was a first-hand witness to the triumph of Bolshevism. After becoming a Polish citizen with the re-establishment of Poland, he witnessed the implementation of the agricultural reforms that followed the Great War.

A sportsman, renowned fencer, and one of the first pilots, he had perfect spoken and written command of many languages and possessed an extraordinary and wide-ranging culture. There was hardly a corner of the world he had not visited and studied: from India to Japan, he travelled through ancient Asia before it had become completely perverted by contact with the West. In America he directly observed the triumph of capitalism and industrialisation in its various stages; he got to know the main ghettos of eastern Europe, also saw them in New York, and observed Zionism at work in Palestine.

He gazed at everything with the objectiveness of a thinker who sees things *sub specie Aeternitatis*,¹ and the conclusions he reached regarding the crisis of the modern world are the most profound ever formulated.

Years in advance, he foresaw and heralded what is now occurring. Indeed, he was so ahead of contemporary thought that he was misunderstood in his own day.

He was one of the first – even ahead of Max Weber and Werner Sombart – to grasp the profoundly Jewish essence of modern capitalism and to show its affinities with Bolshevism.

He was one of the first to realise what support certain exaggerated forms of nationalism unwittingly lend themselves to international subversion.

He was one of the first to fathom the metaphysical essence of the revolutionary movement, showing that what is taking place is actually a religious war, an age-old and worldwide clash between two antagonistic worldviews.

In 1935, an old man weakened by a serious illness, he entrusted me with carrying on and completing his work that had been interrupted. For this purpose, he left me the observations, notes, manuscripts, articles, and books he had collected throughout a life of travel and research, giving me a free hand to use them as I deemed fit. From our mutual

collaboration this book has sprung, which explores the secret history of subversion, a terrifying history that has never been written before, but which is starting to come to light.

I could have supported this work's claims through documentary evidence, but this would only have weighed down a text that is already rich enough. Those interested will find most of this evidence in my other works.²

Because of its innovative historical insights and of Malynski's bold, yet carefully thought-out ideas, this book has elicited both heated enthusiasm and violent criticism, as witnessed by the many letters I have received from readers. It would have been interesting to publish some of these, along with a reply, but this would have required considerable research and would have further lengthened a book that is already dense enough.

I have limited myself to re-editing the text without changing anything, but with the intention of complementing it with another work which will not – as in this case – be a history of the revolutionary principles at work in the modern world, but rather a study of such principles in themselves.

Thus, loyal to the memory of Count Malynski, I will endeavour to complete his task and to carry it on into the future.

August 1938

Léon de Poncins

¹ Latin: 'from the viewpoint of eternity'.—Ed.

² In *Société des Nations, Super État Maçonnique*, I have drawn from a passage of *La Guerre Occulte* that squares perfectly with the Masonic text that provides the foundations for the other work. Those readers interested in the chapter about the Paris Peace Conference will find all the documentary evidence they need in *S.D.N., Super Etat Maçonnique*, which was published by Beauchesne in 1936.

INTRODUCTION

The fight which has broken out in various parts of the West against the dark forces of contemporary subversion, against Communism, collectivism, Jewry, and Freemasonry, cannot be waged to the full until we learn to view history from a very different angle – recent history, as well as the most remote, which actually contains the causes of the former.

For each movement of renewal, the domain of culture constitutes the last bastion of resistance on the part of that which must be overcome. In this domain, mental suggestions and deformations are given free rein in a way, since they are presented under the hypocritical and deceitful guise of 'technicalities'. The reactionary forces which, due to a combination of circumstances, tend to focus their fight on the political and material sectors, believe the cultural domain is essentially harmless and hence to be tolerated, when it actually contains the primary causes of that disorder and subversion which they are simply fighting in its most tangible outer manifestations.

A way of 'doing' history exists and persists, therefore, which is less the product of a mental limitation than of a carefully spread suggestion, whose influence its very victims are the first to ignore. This verdict may be applied to the positivist prejudice, the method which is adopted by so-called 'serious' people and authorised scholars who are 'no visionaries': it follows one rule, which is that of making people believe that there is no such thing as a third dimension of history; that historical events are self-evident, which is to say that they may be explained on the basis of purely social, cultural and political factors; and that there is no 'intention' behind them, no general plan preordained by forces operating behind the scenes. The aim of this 'objective' method is evident: it seeks to prevent people's gaze from falling where it ought to, so that the real forces which make history may continue their underground work without raising any suspicions or being disturbed.

Yet in writing history in modern times, it is difficult for the alleged objectivity of the positivist method not to go hand in hand with another prejudice, namely that of the *evolutionist*. This consists exclusively in presenting the accelerating race towards the abyss as an enthusiastic and free race towards 'progress' and a sequence of increasingly grand and glorious achievements on the part of mankind. We had to find ourselves almost on the brink of the abyss in order to wake up from this hypnosis, which had been created in the workshops of humanism and encyclopaedism. But make no mistakes: while the social and cultural forms of this myth, which are almost invariably connected to the Masonic, rationalist, scientific, and democratic ideology, may now have lost some points in the stock exchange of contemporary values, they endure in more subtle forms, again under the protection of 'technicality'. And once we leave aside the most recent history – where the very force of events, as we have mentioned, has led to an awakening, so that any insistence on the enemy's part would be unwise – and turn to consider more ancient history, what we find is more or less the *statu quo ante*: this history is still presented in the light of 'modern' thought, i.e. the 'aware', 'critical', and 'scientific' thought which, as is

well known, claims to have the last word on human civilisation and still has its followers.

This is why most people are unaware of the history that has unfolded behind visible history; and this is also why the secret history of world subversion still waits to be written, no matter how dismaying or even dreadful the impression it will make upon unprepared spirits.

A group of writers across various countries has today set this as its task. We believe it is crucial for the new Fascist Italy to take due account of the contributions that have already been made to an action the importance of which can hardly be over-emphasised.

In this respect, we ourselves have done and continue to do what we can. René Guénon's masterpiece *The Crisis of the Modern World*,¹ which we have recently translated (Hoepli, Milan 1937), already contains the fundamental points of reference for a historical and cultural revision of this sort and broadly indicates the chief remote causes of contemporary corruption. Another book, which carries our name and yet is not so much a personal work as a timely collection of traditional data, is *Revolt against the Modern World*² (Hoepli, Milan, 1935). This book systematically sheds light on the civilisation which modern subversion has overrun, while at the same time indicating the nature, rhythm, and phases of those processes which have led from the world of our origins and the luminous cycle of the great Aryan and Hyperborean civilisations to the modern world of anti-Tradition and the demon of collectivism. Now, after collaborating with Giovanni Preziosi³ and Roberto Farinacci⁴ in their fight against the most modern forms of subversion, which are closely linked to Jewry, we wish to introduce the Italian public to a third work: the present *The Occult War*, a work jointly written by Count Emmanuel Malinsky and Viscount Léon de Poncins, which readers may want to examine in close connection with the two aforementioned books.

Few Italians nowadays have not heard of the famous *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, the latest edition of which (Baldini e Castoldi, Milan 1938) includes an introduction we ourselves have written in an attempt to clarify the meaning and significance of this important document.⁵ The book we are now presenting may be seen as providing irrefutable historical evidence for the truthfulness of the *Protocols*. We have preferred it to many other, similar works because of its radical character, accuracy, broad perspective, and capacity to really investigate the secret history of the world revolution without stopping at its latest effects, but rather going back to those which in the most recent period – the critical phase proper – have served as their antecedents and prerequisites. It is not a matter of isolated attacks or sweeping accusations: it is the central trunk of Western history itself, as it has been unfolding ever since the Holy Alliance,⁶ which is here made the object of merciless scrutiny.

There is also one other reason why we have chosen this book: its aristocratic and Catholic radicalism. The anti-Jewish and counter-revolutionary approach does not find justification here merely in contingent reasons, such as particular national interests, which are principles betraying the same illness that is allegedly being fought, or compromises due to notorious 'circumstances beyond one's control'; rather, it is rooted in a genuinely

traditional view of the world and the state. One of the great merits of this work is that it emphasises the *metaphysical* essence of the revolutionary movement, by showing how that which is being fought nowadays is not so much a political and social war as a religious one – a battle between two supra-national fronts more than one for the interests of individual nations, races, or parties; that what we are witnessing today, then, is a possibly decisive phase in the clash between two antagonistic worldviews, with more than simply human forces at work on both sides.

Hence, this is not merely a book of rebuke and anti-Semitic or anti-Masonic polemic: rather it directly or indirectly offers the reader many cues to develop a positive, constructive, or re-constructive orientation focused on the essential rather than the accessory, and devoid of any attenuation. Everything the authors say regarding what ought to have been done to curb the initial progression of world subversion, and was not, applies not only to the past but the future as well. The great European and traditional ideal of a bloc of hierarchically arranged nations closing ranks, with lances pointed against the 'infidel', who is one and the same, whatever forms he may take to conceal himself – this return to the great spirit of the Crusades and the need to oppose the single world front of subversion by means of an equally vast front which is as spiritual and imperial as the former is materialistic, international, and anti-national. All this represents a value not only for the past, but for the future as well, and – we have no hesitations in saying so – is the precondition for any genuine victory and reconstruction.

Positive ideas, as a counterpart to the investigation of destructive and subversive processes, are also to be found in the details of this book. If the authors linger, for instance, on the work of Stolypin⁷ – an almost forgotten figure who may have saved Russia from the Bolshevik infection – this is because they take the opportunity to shed light on the essence of a normal and healthy economy, as opposed to the profoundly Judaised economy of modern capitalism, while revealing the causal as well as tactical connections between the latter and Marxism and Bolshevism. The final section of the book not only contains a gripping eyewitness account of the Russian events and what lay behind them, but also provides a paradigm for the slippery slope which 'moderate' liberal, democratic, and socialistic regimes are bound to take sooner or later, thereby unmasking the forces these regimes serve, as they pave the way for the final collapse. In other words, the authors remind us of a historical lesson which, regrettably, many compromising European regimes continue to ignore. The fundamental or indeed – to use a mathematical expression – 'vectorial' unity of the revolutionary phenomenon in all of its forms represents the central thesis of the book. This thesis goes hand in hand with the idea that the phenomenon in question is not spontaneous but induced, not casual but directed by obscure, if nonetheless specific, forces. A 'demonic' tradition of subversion for subversion's sake – Guénon would speak of 'counter-initiation' – runs throughout history, in parallel and eternal opposition to that of genuine spirituality; in it lie the deepest roots of the revolutionary phenomenon.

We have advised the reader to combine his reading of *The Occult War* with that of the two other books we have mentioned: should he also choose to leaf through the aforementioned introduction to the *Protocols*, he would effortlessly gain an overall view

that would allow him to naturally and easily rectify the occasional one-sidedness of the two authors of the present volume. For instance, the reader will soon recognise what can truly and legitimately be ascribed to Jewry alone – a major force of world subversion whose most recent forms, however, have only been made possible by previous involutions of our own civilisation. Secondly, while the reader will grow aware of the possibility of resting the anti-Jewish and anti-Masonic campaign on a Christian and Catholic basis, he will not rule out the idea that, in relation to other civilisations, and possibly certain sections of our own as well, a different formulation of the traditional spirit – itself transcending all particular historical manifestations – may serve as an equally valid basis. The notion of divine right, for instance, which is correctly stressed by the authors, may be found in no less rigorous a form in non-Christian (e.g., Japan) or non-Catholic civilisations (e.g., ancient Russia). The reader will thus have the chance to broaden his horizons: on the one hand, he will be able to identify *all* the forces operating on the front of world subversion, and not simply some of them, however important or striking they may be; and on the other, he will be able to grasp the prerequisites to establish a common counter-revolutionary front – one traditional rather than confessional – fully opposed to the former. In addition, what the author will learn from this book regarding the strategy by which certain forces in the past, blinded by their own particular interests and lack of sensitivity towards a superior idea, have been led to play their enemy's game, may possibly help prevent this same game being played in the future, and cause the bloc of European defence and offence to become truly inaccessible.

We would like to add a few words about the lives of the two authors of *The Occult War*, a work sprung from de Poncins' elaboration of a vast corpus of material gathered by Malinsky.

Count Emmanuel Malinsky, who passed away in May 1938 in Lausanne, was born in Russian Poland. A sportsman and fencer, he had also been one of the first pilots. He had perfect spoken and written command of many languages, and possessed an uncommon and universal sense of culture. There was no corner of the world he had not visited and studied: from India and Japan to America and the various ghettos of Eastern Europe. For thirty years, he examined the essence of the revolutionary phenomenon throughout the world and of the processes concomitant to it, with so sharp an intelligence as to appear almost visionary.

Already many years ago, Malinsky had foreseen and heralded what is now occurring. Indeed, he was so ahead of contemporary thought that he remained unacknowledged in his own day. Even before Max Weber and Werner Sombart, he denounced the secret forces at work behind international capitalism, as well as the latter's essential relation to Judaism and its tactical connections to the proletarian international. His observations regarding the true face of America remain of striking relevance to this day.

In the last years of his life, when he had grown weak due to a serious operation, Count Malinsky entrusted the French viscount Léon de Poncins with continuing the work he had left off by collecting the material he had gathered through his many travels and studies.

De Poncins has been fighting in the struggle against the secret forces of the revolution, and especially Freemasonry and Jewry, for years. He is the author of several works on the matter, which may be regarded as documentary evidence for what is illustrated in the present book in the form of a historical overview. To mention but a few titles: *The Occult Forces of the Revolution*⁸ (translated into six languages), *Freemasonry According to Its Own Secret Documents*,⁹ *The League of Nations: The Masonic Superstate*,¹⁰ *The Mysterious Jewish International*,¹¹ *The Secret History of the Spanish Revolution*,¹² and *Storms over the World*.¹³ What's more, de Poncins has also founded and is the editor of an interesting international magazine called *Contre-Revolution*. In France he is fighting a strenuous battle against the forces which are controlling his country and are destined to drag it down into the abyss, unless an adequate reaction takes place in short order. A staunch traditionalist and Catholic, de Poncins nicely combines a lack of compromise with great understanding: he is one of the precious few men who may be relied upon in the eventuality of establishing a sort of new Order to unite the elite forces of different countries in spirit against the common enemy.

Italy, which is now fully awakening to the Judeo-Communist peril, will certainly appreciate the contribution which this representative of those uncorrupted forces which remain in France is offering to our common action with the present work, together with his late Polish comrade. For our part, we sincerely wish for his difficult struggle to gain ground and find increasingly worthy allies in his home country.

*Quod bonum, felix, faustumque sit.*¹⁴

Rome, 23 November 1938-XVII¹⁵

Julius Evola

¹ *The Crisis of the Modern World* (Hillsdale: Sophia Perennis, 2001).—Ed.

² *Revolt against the Modern World* (Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1995).—Ed.

³ Giovanni Preziosi (1881-1945) was an early Fascist who favoured an adoption of racial measures in Italy to mirror those of the Third Reich. He published the first Italian translation of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in 1920, and Evola wrote an introduction to the second edition in 1937. Preziosi always remained faithful to Mussolini and served in the government at Saló. In April 1945, he committed suicide rather than be captured by the Allies.—Ed.

⁴ Roberto Farinacci (1892-1945) was a First World War veteran who joined the Fascists in 1919. He quickly became a radical leader in the Party, and Mussolini appointed him as Secretary in 1925. He resigned his position in 1926 following policy disagreements with Mussolini. He later fought in the Abyssinian War and the Spanish Civil War, and in 1935 he became a member of the Fascist Grand Council, where he favoured adopting anti-Semitic measures in Italy. In July 1943, he backed Mussolini, and as a result was forced to flee to Germany following the Duce's arrest. The Nazis considered placing him at the head of the Italian Social Republic, but appointed Mussolini after the latter's rescue by Otto Skorzeny. He returned to Italy but remained out of politics, and was executed by anti-Fascist partisans in 1945.—Ed.

⁵ Available in English at web.archive.org/web/20141108100743/http://thompkins_cariou.tripod.com/id68.html.—Ed.

⁶ The Holy Alliance was a coalition of Austria, Prussia and Russia which was signed in Vienna in 1815. Originally it was intended to defend Christian values in Europe, but, as it was used by Austrian Prince Metternich, it became a force to counter the influence of the French Revolution, and opposed both democracy and secularism. Eventually, all the

European states of the time signed onto it, except for Great Britain, the Ottoman Empire, and the Vatican. It is generally regarded to have ceased functioning after the death of Czar Alexander I in 1825.—Ed.

[7](#) Piotr Stolypin (1862-1911) served as both Prime Minister and as Minister of Internal Affairs in Russia. His main focus was on countering revolutionary subversion, toward which end he attempted to institute land reform for the peasant farmers and to improve conditions of urban workers. He was assassinated in Kiev in 1911 by a revolutionary.—Ed.

[8](#) Translated as *Freemasonry and Judaism: Secret Powers Behind Revolution* (Brooklyn, New York: A & B Books, 1994).—Ed.

[9](#) *La Dictature des Puissances Occultes: La F.M. d'après ses Documents Secrets* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1934).—Ed.

[10](#) *Société des Nations, Super État Maçonnique* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1936).—Ed.

[11](#) *Le Mystérieuse Internationale Juive* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1936).—Ed.

[12](#) *Histoire Secrète de la Révolution Espagnole* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1938).—Ed.

[13](#) *Tempête sur le Monde; ou, La Faillite du Progrès* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1934).—Ed.

[14](#) Latin: 'May it be good, prosperous, and auspicious!'—Ed.

[15](#) Designating year 17 of the Fascist Era, the Italian Fascist calendar whose commencement coincided with the March on Rome in 1922.—Ed.

The Nineteenth Century: The Revolution Awakens

The entire history of the nineteenth century was shaped by the evolution of the revolutionary movement, from 1879 down to Russian Bolshevism.

This underground struggle began with the French Revolution, which was backed by the 'Illuminati' assembled at the Congress of Wilhelmsbad under the presidency of the Bavarian professor, Weishaupt. This city had been under siege for a few decades: since the time of Voltaire, Rousseau, the *Encyclopédie*, and the spread of Masonic lodges. One of its most beautiful districts was stormed and its inhabitants were drafted in order to attack the surrounding areas.

As might have happened during an actual siege, this part of the citadel was taken back by those people who had been put under siege after fierce fighting during Napoleonic times. The assailants then withdrew and took cover. In the stronghold, however, they left a contagious germ which spread, to the point of making France the *enfant terrible* of Europe in the nineteenth century.

France witnessed the birth of revolutions which progressively and imperceptibly altered the appearance of the Christian world and the inner structure of European society under the pseudonyms of liberal, noble, and generous ideas. Revolutionary elements benefitted from this, starting with the Jews. The deep history of the nineteenth century, down to the World War, is the history of this struggle – largely a mute and deaf one – between the attackers, who knew well what they were doing, and the besieged, who were unaware of what was taking place.

This process lasted exactly one hundred and two years – 1815 to 1917 – and has led to two results.

The first is the transformation of one-sixth of the inhabited world into a revolutionary hotbed steeped in Freemasonry and Judaism, in which the infection is developing and growing aware of what forces it has easily managed to organise in view of the second phase of its plan.

The second result consists in the transformation of the rest of the planet into a weak and divided realm in which – much like the house Christ described – is inwardly torn by resentful rivalries and petty hatreds. The world was rendered incapable – at least until just recently, as new anti-Marxist currents have emerged after the War – of any offensive or even defensive initiative against an enemy whose forces and daring had considerably increased and which, confident of its immunity, believed it could continue to attack without ever having to defend itself.

Ultimately, the cause of all this is the fact that the world was so dominated by capitalism, so drained by democracy, so shaken by socialism, and divided by misunderstood nationalisms that it was no longer capable of offering any firm resistance to such an attack.

In 1813, traditional and Christian Europe had finally chosen to firmly react against the revolution, as embodied by Napoleon. The fight was against the revolution, not France:

just as one will fight against the illness a person is suffering from, and not the person himself. The greatest proof of this may be found in the fact that the winners at the Congress of Vienna in no way took advantage of their victory against France, which lost none of its territories when it reverted to being an honourable and highly esteemed monarchy.

The divinely-appointed monarchs of Europe were merely expiating their guilt: for they had risked losing their crowns and plunging their peoples in the turmoil of democracy a century before the date allotted by fate.

The sovereigns' guilt lay in the fact that, as far as short-sightedness goes, they had all managed to outdo Louis XVI.¹ The latter had insisted on merely seeing casual movements of revolt due to contingent dissatisfactions in his country, where the revolutionary age was in fact dawning. Similarly, European monarchs yielded to petty nationalistic rivalries instead of standing as one man and forgetting about their ongoing differences – mere family squabbles by comparison – in such a way as they could have nipped the germ threatening the world in the bud, before it could show itself and spread. Like far too many of our contemporaries, these rulers appear not to have realised that a new chapter of history was in the making.

The nineteenth-century war *par excellence* was that between overlapping social strata; the war of universal democracy against the universal elite; the war of the Low against the High. The war of the Most Low against the Most High² must follow on as a logical consequence. Where democracy triumphed, there the Low became the High and then had to defend itself against something lower still, which in turn was destined to find itself in the same situation as soon as it had attained power and supremacy. In principle, this was always the war of democracy against a relative aristocracy; and things were fated to continue in this way until we hit rock bottom.

To this day, only Russia has reached absolute zero, below which there is nothing. Thus it is the only country in history in which the revolution has come to a standstill and is not spreading any deeper. Instead, it is merely spreading – nor could things be any different.

Against our claim that the Bolshevik revolution has reached the deepest level, one might point out that, on the contrary, it has yet to win the hearts of the vast majority of Russians. Anyone resorting to a similar argument, even in good faith – for many only adopt it to conceal the truth – shows he is no different from those who consider the modern revolution or democracy (which is nothing but an extension of the latter) as an expression 'of the people, by the people, and for the people'. Actually, the revolution and democracy are only means employed as part of an overall conspiratorial plan aimed at stripping the positively aristocratic group and idea that have always been above and beyond most of humanity of their power over the people.

The bourgeois revolution, democracy, the 'social' revolution, and Communism are but episodes in the vast conflict between two great principles: one embodied by integral Christianity and the other by the anti-Church. If Satan rebelled in the name of freedom and equality vis-à-vis God, this was not merely so as 'not to serve'; rather, it was in order to

subjugate others by replacing the legitimate authority of the Most High.

The people, therefore, are not the subject but the object of this evolution of alleged democratic progress, punctuated by violent revolutions accelerating its march.

Human hierarchies remained after people had started to break away from Christ: the Renaissance. Princes and kings endured after breaking away from the Pope and the Emperor: the Reformation. The bourgeoisie remained after turning away from the aristocracy, headed by its kings and princes: the French Revolution. The people remained after transcending the plans of the bourgeoisie: 1848-1917. Once the masses themselves had been transcended, all that remained was scum led by the Jew: 1917.

Once the revolution will have arrived at its lowest depth, as in Russia – and by extension, as will be the case once the entire world ends up looking like the decayed empire of the Tsars – it will not be concerned with what the people thinks any more than we might be concerned with what our rams or oxen have in mind: for we know that a few pieces of artillery would be quite enough to exterminate all herd animals put together without the slightest risk on our part.

[1](#) Louis XVI (1754-1793) was the King of France at the time of the Revolution, and was executed.—Ed.

[2](#) Evola translated this passage as ‘the war of the underworld against the divine world’.—Ed.

The Holy Alliance: Metternich, Champion of the Counter- Revolution¹

After a century of bitter experiences and utter disappointments, only a very few among our contemporaries have grasped the true meaning of revolution and democracy. Hence, we should not be surprised to find that in 1815 the Allies, for whom this monster was still something new, felt rather confused.

Still, the most intelligent statesman of this period, and the least short-sighted one of the nineteenth century, Prince Metternich,² appears to have realised what a terrifying nightmare was looming on the horizon. Metternich never ceased doing his best to make the Congress of Vienna something more than merely a pretty sunset for sovereigns.

Of all those gathered in this assembly – which was exclusively comprised of noblemen – Metternich alone managed to rise above the contingent interests of his own country in an attempt to establish a united and enduring front for facing not so much external dangers, as the inner peril threatening all European nations.

The measures taken to forestall the possibility of Napoleon's comeback were directed less against the great commander than against the man who had proclaimed himself to be the 'Messiah of the Revolution' from the rocks of Saint Helena. Napoleon's myth had been usurped by democracy, which had confiscated his laurels in order to conceal its sordid rags under a heroic mantle.

Metternich held nothing against France as such – the old, traditional France of the Bourbons; what he mistrusted was the country in which the 'new' mentality appeared to have its headquarters. The future was destined to prove just how right Metternich was.

The tragedy of the French Revolution had not taken place in vain before Metternich's eyes. He was never to forget this lesson, which had proven useless for many others. He had witnessed the 'liberal and enlightened' Constitution pave the way for the Gironde³ and the Terror, which had started with embraces and ended with beheadings. He had seen how liberalism is nothing but a prelude to Jacobinism,⁴ and harboured no illusions concerning the high-flown words that charmed feeble and suggestible minds.

Because of his foresight, Metternich became the greatest *bête noire* of all the 'noble, sensitive, and generous hearts' who devotedly rallied under the banner of the 'immortal principles' upheld by the faithless and lawless 'giants' of the French Revolution. To this day, when so much evidence can be found to confirm Metternich's ideas, they still blame him for having lumped together Jacobinism and liberalism, free thought, and the nationality principle, as expressions of the same sect, plague, and volcano.

Metternich was not as blind as many of our contemporary conservatives and nobles. While having been offered so many occasions to study these symptoms in all their apparent diversity – phenomena carefully differentiated so as to only progressively deliver small shocks – these men have failed to realise the intrinsic unity and causal relationships

among things that, for over a century, have been mutually distinguished merely as a way of fooling and confounding the short-sighted with a range of different names: liberalism, humanitarianism, tolerance, free thought, modernism, constitutionalism, and parliamentarism – idyllic preludes to Jacobinism, radicalism, Communism, the Committee of Public Safety, and the Cheka.

Metternich's superiority compared to all other statesmen of his century – not to mention those of later times – lies precisely in the fact that he grasped the evil of the future as a united whole and synthesis. Having gained awareness of this united front which carries many different names, Metternich sought to assemble all the forces on his side – all those which the Revolution regarded as future obstacles – in order to form another united front, transcending national differences and capable of facing the former everywhere in Europe.

This unprecedented and creative innovation in the political domain may be summed up as follows: 'Now in Europe there is no enemy to the Right' – the corollary of this being: 'All that which is on the Left, or even outside the integral Right, is the enemy'.

From this perspective, Metternich agrees with Lenin, but not with any contemporary conservative.

The two other men of state from this period whom history books tend to put on the same level as Metternich, namely Cavour⁵ and Bismarck, were a great Italian and a great Prussian – or great German at most – whereas Metternich was not so much a great Austrian as a great European.⁶ Steeped in the traditions of the Holy Roman Empire, which for centuries had been ruled by his sovereign's forefathers, Metternich was less concerned with his own country of Austria than he was with Europe. He was certainly one of the greatest Europeans after Charlemagne. Metternich was not one of those senseless men for whom the highest diplomatic refinement lies in complacently gazing at a neighbour's house as it catches fire. Men of this sort do not realise they are living in an age in which all houses in the city of Europe conceal explosive material in their basements, their own homes being no exception.

Metternich would never have struck an alliance with the Carbonari⁷ and the Freemasons, as Cavour did to serve contingent patriotic interests. In drawing this pact with subversion, Cavour placed re-established Italy on a slippery slope that was gradually drawing it towards Bolshevism. The country would already have been engulfed, had it not been saved, against all hopes at a time when everything seemed lost, by a genuine miracle which Cavour could never have foreseen.⁸

Metternich would never have encouraged the establishment of a republican democratic regime in a neighbouring country under the pretext that it represented a potential rival to be weakened and demeaned.

This, however, is precisely what Bismarck did with France, despite being a monarchist and conservative. An unconscious tool of subversion, he found nothing better to do than wage war against the Catholic Church and join the Jew Lassalle.⁹ The latter's state socialism was presented as being non-international and capable of reinforcing the

administrative and economic centralisation of the German Empire.

Things were intended to continue in this way until the process of centralisation would have reached completion. Then a simple change in personnel would have sufficed to transform this empire, governed by an aristocratic oligarchy apparently as powerful as ever, into a republic governed – far more despotically – by a Jewish oligarchy.

Lenin has described this process in his works, and Lassalle himself alludes to it in his correspondence with his coreligionist Karl Marx.

Nationalism leads to its own suicide when it has reached this level of intensity and density.

Metternich saw the ultimate peril, but no one else did: for this reason, he hardly trusted anyone else, from France down to Russia. And how could things have been any different, when he had realised he was the only one to see the point of intersection of all the various forces corroding society in his day?

For what reason, then, did a plan of this sort – stemming from such exceptional foresight and such detailed evaluation of the overall character of an age – not attain the results one might have legitimately expected?

Before answering this question, we should hasten to point out that it would be unjust not to consider the uninterrupted peace which Christian Europe enjoyed between 1815 and 1853 as a great blessing for the peoples of the continent. During this time there were no wars or serious crises, and none of the nervous tension among nations that has ruined our contemporaries' nerves over the course of subsequent years.

Complete pacification for forty years in a row represents a good record. Our grandfathers owed this to Metternich's anti-democratic view of international relations. Certainly, it was great; but it might have come to much more.

The reason for the ultimate failure of the work conceived at Vienna lies in the fact that a plan will only bear fruit if it is fully adopted and implemented, not if it strikes any sort of compromise, including a partial one. While far more consistent and complete than that of all later congresses and conferences, the work of the Congress of Vienna remained a compromise between the view of the Austrian Chancellor and the idiosyncrasies of the other participants.

Metternich's thesis concerned a defensive and offensive alliance among all the Christian and absolutist¹⁰ monarchs of Europe. These rulers were to regard themselves as fathers to their peoples and brothers to one another. They were to mutually secure one another's frontiers, as defined by the Treaty, so as to avoid all discord, and jointly strive to oppose all subversive moves that might have threatened – or simply challenged – their shared dignity as absolute and divinely appointed sovereigns. This was the 'Each for all and all for each' of the kings; in other words, a White International or League of Nations of the Right – an imperial and royal anticipation of President Wilson's democratic and Masonic dream.

The Holy Alliance was doomed to failure right from the start for two reasons which ultimately coincide, but which we shall treat separately.

The first reason already contains the second as a potential. We shall start from it, as it possesses a more general character.

If we were to imagine ourselves standing by the banks of the blue Danube in the year 1815, in that place where the Holy Alliance was first established, we would discover to our amazement that someone was missing among its many and highly distinguished godfathers. This was someone who by all reason ought to have acted as the keystone of the new political and social edifice that was then being built. It was the 'cornerstone' Christ mentions in the Gospel, and without which the kind of unity in diversity the Holy Alliance was aspiring towards cannot be attained. It was the rock – Peter – that ensured the unity in diversity of Christian nations from Constantine the Great down to Luther, Calvin, and their disciples.

Since the late fifteenth century, there has no longer been any spiritual unity: only confessional and ideological divergences.

The Reformation was the first revolutionary offensive, the first attack against Order. The latter rests not on mere force but on Faith, which follows no criterion but itself. What we mean by this is that Faith may resort to force but ought not to be confused with any force seeking to artificially create a faith for itself which it might then make use of. There is a veritable gulf between these two conceptions.

While the Reformation, as a religious revolution, may not have killed the letter of divine right, it killed its spirit, leaving the second act of the subversive work up to social and political revolution. The Reformation killed it as far as the constitutional guarantee of absolute regimes is concerned, which rests on the moral Law drawn from the Gospel.

This moral Law, which is the ultimate resource for man and independent individuals against force and sheer numbers – which amount to the same thing – possesses absolute and universal value. It is always the same regardless of time and place, and is above the whims of the masses, as well as those of princes and elites.

To claim that authority is necessary for order is to speak only half the truth. Authority must also rest on something unchangeable and universal – not on what will be true today but wrong tomorrow (nationalism).¹¹ Otherwise, conflict will necessarily arise between today's truth and tomorrow's, between this truth and that. In such a case, paradoxical as it may seem, as local and temporal authorities become stronger and more confident in their truths, the more universal anarchy will spread. This may easily be observed today by gazing at the world from a bird's-eye view, rather than by looking through a magnifying glass to see what is taking place within an area of a few square kilometres only in a particular season.

For authority to rest on something solid, it must rest on the notion of divine right, for this is the only thing solid and enduring, like God himself.

Divine right – as the name itself suggests – is not the right of kings, nor that of the Pope.

Rather, it is the right of the Christian God, as it has been expressed through his Law. Heads of state are but its vicars, the Pope merely being the first among all vicars. Joseph de Maistre,¹² who lived at the time of the Congress of Vienna, was only half right in arguing that the Pope should be the moderator of kings. The Pope and the kings are merely interpreters of the Law, each in their respective domains; in this regard, they act as its sovereign executors. The Pope nonetheless represents the only visible rallying symbol, a symbol of unity in diversity, which is to say of what is true and unchangeable across time and space.

Herein lies the essence of divine right.

One might respond that monarchies of divine right have their origin in acts of force. While this is certainly the case, if such acts of force became divine right, or rather *the* divine right, it means they became subordinate to it – and this implies a duty as well as a right. In such manner, monarchies made their way back into the universal and unchangeable order of the great fold, abiding to the same creed and uniform catechism – the latter being but the creed in action. What more is needed, in practice?

At the very antipodes of divine right stands national will,¹³ which will be precisely true here but wrong there, true today but wrong tomorrow.

The kings who chose the Reformation voted for what was destined to do away with the very principle in virtue of which they were reigning by God's grace to begin with. In wishing to free themselves from the yoke of God's Word, they fell under the yoke of the incoherent words of men. Without realising it, by bartering their divine right for national will, they sold their birthright for a plate of lentils.

The demolition work begun by Protestantism was carried on by philosophising, atheism, democratism, civicism, nationalism,¹⁴ and capitalism.

With the advent of the Reformation, divine right ceased to exist. For some time, it continued to subsist as pure virtuality, as in the case of those extinguished or vanished stars whose light still reaches us; divine right, however, will never return to being reality.

The Revolution was already contained in the Reformation, as there was a direct relation of cause and effect between the two. In the countries where the Reformation has triumphed, what has occurred is not any visible revolution, but rather a latent and progressive revolution which has led to the same result: namely, the worship of abstraction and ideas in place of God, according to a sort of mythological divine right.

As what stands at the summit of this new right is not what is superior but what is inferior, what we literally have is a house built upside-down.¹⁵

¹ Evola entitled this chapter 'The Holy Alliance: The Last European'.—Ed.

² Prince Klemens Wenzel von Metternich (1773-1859) was an Austrian statesman who was one of the most important European diplomats of the nineteenth century. He was involved in the negotiation of the Treaty of Paris in 1814, which marked the end of the Napoleonic Wars. At the Congress of Vienna in 1815, he was instrumental in establishing the new map of Europe, and the balance of power between the Great Powers which was to last, more or less intact, until the First World War. Although he was generally a reactionary, he did believe that the Austro-Hungarian Empire needed to protect

equal rights for all its ethnic groups, and even proposed the creation of a parliament to this end, but he was unable to enact such reforms. He was forced to resign during the Revolution of 1848.—Ed.

[3](#) The Gironde was a political party during the early years of the French Revolution. Most of them were sentenced to death and executed after they came into dispute with the revolutionary government, favouring a more moderate course of action.—Ed.

[4](#) The Jacobin Club, a political group in eighteenth-century France, was one of the driving forces of the French Revolution. Since then, ‘Jacobin’ has often been used as a generic term for Left-wing radicals.—Ed.

[5](#) Camillo Benso, Count of Cavour (1810-1861) was the founder of the Liberal Party in Italy, and he became the first Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Italy, although he died after only three months in office.—Ed.

[6](#) Evola’s version: ‘The other men of state from this period whom history books tend to put on the same level as Metternich, essentially appear to have been great representatives of their own nations.’—Ed.

[7](#) The Carbonari were a secret society in nineteenth-century Italy that was dedicated to bringing about liberal reforms.—Ed.

[8](#) Evola’s version: ‘Metternich would never have struck an alliance with Carbonari and the Freemasons, as Cavour did. It is true that Cavour drew a pact with subversion for specific tactical reasons, in the name of the unity of the Italian fatherland. In doing so, re-established Italy was placed on a slippery slope that was gradually drawing it towards Bolshevism. It might have already been engulfed, had it not been saved, against all hopes at a time when in many people’s minds everything was lost, by a genuine miracle – the Fascist counter-revolution – which Cavour could never have foreseen.’—Ed.

[9](#) Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864) was a German-Jewish Hegelian philosopher and political activist who first introduced the idea of universal socialism into Germany. He and Bismarck corresponded and had a number of secret meetings regarding political ideas.—Ed.

[10](#) Evola has ‘authoritarian’ here instead.—Ed.

[11](#) Evola version: ‘...not on what will be truth today but error tomorrow (democracy), or part truth and part error (misunderstood nationalism).’—Ed.

[12](#) Joseph de Maistre (1753–1821) was a French Counter-Enlightenment philosopher who fled the Revolution and lived the remainder of his life in Italy. He always remained a staunch opponent of democracy and supported monarchical rule.—Ed.

[13](#) Evola adds: ‘the will of deconsecrated and materialised nations’.—Ed.

[14](#) Evola has ‘collectivist nationalism’.—Ed.

[15](#) Evola has, ‘is an overturning of the traditional edifice’.—Ed.

The Holy Alliance: Nationalism and Universalism

Our contemporaries, including those who are directly threatened by subversion, realise no more than our great-grandfathers did that in order to effectively react against this global peril, one must return not to the outlook of the eighteenth, seventeenth, or even the sixteenth century, but to the spirit of the Crusades.

We should add that it is not a matter of returning to the use of tallow candles, coaches, serfdom, and witch-hunting, but of reverting to that spirit which did for the forces of good what subversion is doing today for those of evil: a united Christian front, headed by its leader; a single unit with lances raised, set in square formation against the infidel, which is also one – although it is everywhere, and, like certain tropical insects, knows how to change its colour to match that of the leaves it is gnawing and the place where it is.

The Restoration, strictly speaking, was not a counter-revolution that made a blank sweep of all that had taken place – and herein lies its weakness.

Forgetful of the Gospel's warning, this feeble and overly cautious reaction did its best to pour the old wine of traditional royalty, that which had shaped the kingdom of France, into the new, bloody flasks left by the regicides.

The result, as we all know, was what had been predicted in the Gospel. This chiefly defensive plan, far from leading to any triumphs, led only to disasters. It was drawn by the kind of 'moderates' who sluggishly hold back but never make any about-face or reverse turn, so that those following them always end up treading on their corpses.

In 1815, Austria alone practically and realistically grasped the historical truth. It alone, through the eyes of its Chancellor, saw that the only way to react against a historical, conspiratorial plan conceived long before 1789, a total conspiracy both religious and profane, was a total reaction – not a partial one simply targeting contingent symptoms.

One is not cured of a poison by the administration of the same poison diluted in sugar water.

When a household turns to the spiritual descendants of Louis XVI's killers for help against those of Nicholas II,¹ how can it not perish? Likewise, when the European household turned to the spiritual descendent of Charles I's² murderers in 1815 for help against those of Louis XVI, how could it not have collapsed?³

Once the seamless robe of Christ was torn by the Reformation, the acute xenophobia of modern nationalism ensued, with its short-sighted self-interest, which only increased the advantage of the common enemy. Christian Europe thus became unmanageable. It can no longer express unity in diversity, no matter how much care may be taken to respect such diversity – which is certainly respectable in itself. Let imbeciles continue to scream from their rooftops that religion is nothing now: religion is in fact all, and everything follows from it. This is why the Holy Alliance failed to become a new Holy Roman Empire.

The Holy Alliance is to the Holy Roman Empire what the League of Nations is to the

Holy Alliance.

The League of Nations is a demagogy of demagogies and an incoherence of incoherences. It thus amounts to a demagogy and incoherence squared: in other words, it is a parliament of parliaments, a nation of nations, and a crowd of crowds.

Besides, the Holy Alliance does not really stand halfway between the Holy Roman Empire and the League of Nations. It is rather closer to the latter, for let us not forget that two of its members, France and Britain, were already constitutional regimes at the time, with parliaments their leaders had to reckon with.

To sum up, the illness which was destined to lead the Holy Alliance to its death was an original one, inherent in its moment of history. No one could do a thing against it in 1815, as there was no way of retroactively suppressing Luther, Voltaire, Calvin, and Rousseau. It was the ghosts of these men – along with those of Cromwell and Robespierre, united in the fight against their common enemy – that ultimately murdered the Holy Alliance: for the Alliance had failed to suppress them a second time, in their graves.

An outward sign of this original sin was the absence of the Pope.

The Pope would have been a rallying symbol of unity. The Pope is the only person on Earth who can claim to be above all and stand out like a common banner, without anyone down here feeling humiliated or belittled: for he is only a defenceless moral principle, an unarmed old man who represents He whose ‘kingdom is not of this world’. Once the Pope is not there to say *pax vobiscum*,⁴ instead of the silence of bowed crowned heads all we have is the voice of people singing *France d’abord*, *Italia sopra tutto*, or *Deutschland über Alles* – so loudly as to make their neighbours inaudible.⁵

Right from its birth, the Holy Alliance carried a deadly illness in its bosom. As we shall see later on in this work, the two states which had sprung from the Reformation and which nourished the memory of the Revolution were its *enfants terribles*, and ultimately tore it to pieces. This process lasted some time, almost forty years, during which the void grew bigger and bigger; imperceptibly, the Holy Alliance – or what was still left of it on paper – became a myth whose only tangible expression was Austria.

With its kingdoms, principalities, and earldoms, and its peoples, languages, and races, all peacefully united under the same sceptre, this vestige of the Holy Roman Empire already embodied – albeit on a lesser scale – the form and character of a Holy Alliance, in which Catholicism held primacy over nationalism.⁶

Both politically and religiously, Austria was thus the Catholic state *par excellence*. This is why it became an object of hatred for all forms of Protestantism, nationalism, and democracy.⁷

Austria alone might have continued to be the driving force behind the Holy Alliance, which it assimilated to the Holy Roman Empire, without having managed to include the Pope within it – for what could it do against three, or even four other states?

Austria remained such until the day when its former partners inevitably turned against

her. The voice of historical affinities – freed from contingencies and from the accident of the Holy Alliance, and revamped by the untiring action of modern subversion – ultimately made itself heard. It had been stifled by fear for forty years, but the natural inclination that had been suppressed came back with a bang.

The Revolution of 1830 marks the historical failure of the Holy Alliance.

Bearing in mind what we have said so far, let us now examine why Metternich's idea failed, after having given the peoples of Europe forty years of peace and prosperity.

Metternich's great salvation plan failed because, despite the agreements signed, a united front against the return of the revolution existed only on paper. If the most important clause of these agreements – the right, or rather duty, to intervene – had been followed,⁸ it is most likely that after 1789 – which was swept away by 1815 – there would have been no 1848. Consequently, as everything is linked, there would have been no 1866, no 1870, and finally no 1914 or 1917 – years that have plunged us⁹ into the deadly doldrums in which we lay dying, and all for the greater glory of the Masonic triangle and the star of Israel.

If the solidarity among kings, at a time when they were still in control of the situation, had been anything like that among the Jews, the latter would never have suppressed the former. Yet despite the lessons of the French Revolution, after averting imminent dangers, monarchs returned to thinking and acting as they had in the eighteenth century, that is: according to contingent, self-serving interests.

Leaving aside the case of Belgium and that of the Spanish colonies in South America, which are not as relevant to our subject, it was France which delivered the first blow against the pact of Vienna.

The Revolution of 1830¹⁰ was a case foreseen by the principle of intervention. Legitimate sovereigns ruling 'by grace of God' had mutually ensured their own legitimacy.

This time, the insurrection ousted a legitimate king ruling 'by grace of God', a sovereign whom God alone ought to have called to himself, or a legitimate successor should have replaced. A legitimate successor indeed existed, yet another one was chosen.

This new successor embodied the 'happy medium' mentality, the bourgeois and mediocre mentality *par excellence*. He stood for the monarchical tradition and the revolutionary one simultaneously.

This man had been chosen because the people liked them: he was the King of the French, not the King of France – not the hereditary holder of France, but rather the first civil servant of the country. Like all civil servants, he could be dismissed.

On an official level too, he was described not as ruler 'by grace of God', but 'by grace of the nation': a new formula which clearly applied not to a monarchy, but to a republic posing as a monarchy. The kingdom was thus stripped of the principle that constituted its very *raison d'être*.

The distinction between these two formulas is no mere nuance, for a chasm exists between the two worlds they embody: that of logic and that of illogic. Logically speaking, what is above cannot be straightforwardly subordinated to what is below, without ceasing to be above. The claim that the People is not the sum of the individuals it is comprised of, but rather a quasi-metaphysical entity beyond and above all, is nothing but sophistry – or, to put it more simply, a bad joke.

This claim is extremely dangerous, despite its apparent moderation, whose aim is not to frighten moderate milieus. We should not forget that even socialists and Bolsheviks are mostly saying the same thing: factory workers in industrial countries such as Britain and workers and farmers in rural countries such as Russia make up the majority of the people; hence, by the democratic virtue of numbers, they make up the People with a capital P.

Once we accept the thesis that power stems from the will of the people, there is no longer any need to theoretically proceed on to Bolshevism: there is only a logical and progressive development of the doctrine. An actual chasm exists only between the idea of rule ‘by grace of God’ and that of rule ‘by the will of the nation’; it is here that the slippery slope starts. The entire history of the nineteenth century proves it.

Leaving Switzerland aside, France was the first country on the continent to cross this chasm for the second time, in 1830. This was a repetition of the Revolution, yet it was so discretely carried out that no one foresaw its consequences and no one suspected that France had in principle ceased to be a monarchy.

With the return of the tricolour in place of the *fleurs-de-lys*,¹¹ France reverted to its revolutionary and Napoleonic tradition. It turned to promoting democracy and national self-determination, thus newly adopting the revolutionary testament of which Napoleon had claimed to be the executor at Saint Helena.

It was to fight against these very principles that the Holy Alliance had been established in the first place.

There is only one international Right: that of divine right, of the principle of authority from on high. By virtue of this principle, not merely the king but also every father and legitimate superior represents God, provided he keeps the commandments. Likewise, there is only one international Left: that of popular will, of the principle of authority from below – of authority stemming from those who should obey. But if those below do not obey, then there can be no order, not even in a small shop or humble family, not to mention in a state. For how could one both command in principle and obey in practice? Take the Bolshevik ‘Soviets’: in theory, the colonels and officers only give orders according to the will of those who should obey them in their regiments, namely the representatives of the soldiers gathered in the assembly, or ‘Soviet’. This is what happens when the principle of ‘national will’ is logically applied on all levels, instead of being illogically confined to any individual one. This is a principle opposite to that of ‘divine right’, by virtue of which colonels will give orders in the name of the king, who in turn will rule in God’s name.

The most crucial difference between these two principles rests on a point of the utmost importance: the fact that the government of divine right is neither arbitrary nor absolute,

since it is guided and limited by the laws of Christian morality.

Nor could things be any different. All we need is a little logic to understand that a ‘visible lieutenant of God’ – whether he is a king, father, or leader – cannot act against the precise instructions given by his invisible captain, God or Christ, without undermining his own authority.

So-called national will – which is to say the will of the majority: a plebeian, ignorant, inconsistent, and incoherent will – has no one it must be accountable towards. It remains legitimate, legal, and supreme whatever it may do, whatever tribulations it imposes, and whatever crimes, impieties, extravagances, and abominations it commits. This will does not take the place of the king, but of He who makes all kings rule – God.

People do not realise that this path remains legally open as soon as *the principle of national will has replaced that of divine right*.

All European nations now find themselves on this path. This is the reason why they are so reluctant to fight Bolshevism, which is merely preceding them along it. For ultimately, Bolshevism stems from the same ideological principle: the alleged will of the masses of farmers and workers – alleged, that is, because the masses actually play no part in determining the public will.

It is the Anonymous, Imperceptible, and Invulnerable that does so in their stead, here and there. The Anonymous can only be grasped and perceived when it takes the form of the ‘people’s commissar’ – invariably a Jew, as one would expect. In other cases, however, it makes sure to conceal itself more prudently. It is the will of the Anonymous which replaces that of kings or even God.

But while all European nations now find themselves on this path, things were not so in 1830. At the time, France alone abandoned the body of nations destined to serve as a bulwark against the revolution. France walked out just like that, without banging any doors, and joined the other side of the barricade. Many Frenchmen were very proud of this – indeed, many still are! But how long will they continue to feel that way? Only the future will tell.

¹ Nicholas II (1868-1918) was the last Tsar of Russia, executed by the Bolsheviks.—Ed.

² Charles I (1625-1649) was the King of England, Ireland, and Scotland until his execution during the English Civil War, when the revolutionary forces of Oliver Cromwell insisted on a constitutional monarchy for England.—Ed.

³ This passage is missing in Evola’s edition.—Ed.

⁴ Latin: ‘peace with you’.—Ed.

⁵ Evola’s version: ‘One of the exterior signs of this original sin was the absence of the Pope, who – at least for Catholic nations – might have served as a rallying symbol of higher unity. More generally, a Leader was missing who, as a representative of pure spiritual authority in the fullness of its universality and transcendence, might have imposed his own right over all and risen like a common banner, without any of the great men down here feeling humiliated or belittled, given the transcendence and supra-political quality of his very function. If this supreme and intangible point of reference is wanting, and this pure spiritual authority is silent, what is left is simply the voice of people singing *Rule Britannia*, *La France d’abord* or *Deutschland über Alles* – so loudly as to make their neighbours inaudible.’—Ed.

6 Evola adds, ‘over all particular interests’.—Ed.

7 Evola has, ‘Protestantism, liberalism, and democracy’.—Ed.

8 This clause stated that the other powers would come to the aid of any member state in the event of an uprising against the monarchy there. Although the Alliance did intervene to crush a number of rebellions in its early years, by 1825 rising antagonisms between the various powers caused it to lapse.—Ed.

9 Instead of ‘us’, Evola has ‘most of Europe’.—Ed.

10 In the July Revolution of 1830, the monarch of France, Charles X, was overthrown by his opposition, and a constitutional monarchy was established to replace him. The new government took France out of the Holy Alliance. The monarchy itself was finally disbanded altogether in 1870.—Ed.

11 The *fleurs-de-lys*, a stylised lily that was often used in French heraldry, was closely identified with the French monarchy.—Ed.

1848: The Beginning of the World Revolution¹

With the French revolution of 1830, the united front of counter-revolution was broken. France became a breeding ground for the kind of revolutionary ideas which ultimately led to the 1848 revolution, as people waited for the day in which the country would have taken a stand as the official champion of nationalisms² and political equality. The causes of the 1848 revolution are so futile and imperceptible that it is best to ignore them and simply note that the revolution broke out because it was destined to.

Ultimately, what is it that the populace of Paris wanted?

It would be difficult to answer this question other than with the old refrain: 'It did not know what it wanted, but wanted it very badly.' Apparently, it wanted universal happiness on Earth. But then who doesn't?

The specific variant of this idea in 1848 was the happiness of others as well as one's own, meaning nationalism for those 'groaning under foreign yoke' and democracy for oneself – since the French already had nationalism.³

The words 'yoke', 'groaning', and 'foreign' were all treated as synonyms. Likewise, the word 'happiness' was regarded as synonymous with democracy, republic, and nationalism.

How can one be so naïve as to even imagine that the common sense of the people, which is so adverse to abstraction by nature, drew this cloudy ideology from out of its bosom?

The people is the same everywhere. At times it seems to show extreme generosity without understanding a thing, while at other times it behaves ferociously for no apparent reason; sensitive to the point of silliness at times, even when there is no reason to be moved, at other times it remains impassive or even acts cynically when it ought to react or even become enraged so as not to be shamed. The people is what certain elements would like it to be. Such elements crown the people, as they know full well that sovereignty will always rest in their own hands.

This is the root of all infatuation with democracy, as was the case in Paris in 1848. The French people then wanted a republic. Soon after, it wanted the empire again, and war in the name of nationalism. Such was the plan of the international conspiracy.

It was argued at the time that France was not a nation like the rest: that its own patriotism was too small for its big heart and that the country had to embrace all nationalisms on Earth – without actually ascertaining whether these were real or merely figments of the imagination. France owed this to itself, for it had inherited the mission of the French Revolution; and an honour of this sort justified all sacrifices.

The happiness of men – people argued – does not consist of good health, well-being, or security. What a disgracefully materialist view this was for men who, in the name of evolutionism, claimed to be nothing but the offspring of apes! Nor – they continued – does happiness consist in the joys of the heart and spirit, this being mere sentimentalism unworthy of strong minds. Happiness for them consisted of two things: first of all, in

having politicians elected by universal suffrage; and secondly, in having politicians and ministers who all speak the same language. They need not share the same ethnic background, for they may be pure-blooded Semites, without this posing the slightest inconvenience. In this respect, the nationalist dogma was most generous: indeed, it considered it a sign of bad taste to even regard its policy as a form of accommodation.

The great revolutions of 1848 signalled the beginning of the political, social, and economic rise of the Jewish people. Throughout Europe, the Jews became what they had already been in the aftermath of the French Revolution: citizens of the countries where they had set up their gold Bedouin tents, citizens on the same footing as actual nationals – Germans in Germany, Prussians in Prussia, Austrians in Austria, Hungarians in Hungary, and Italians in Italy. They did not become such all of a sudden, but only gradually, as one revolution was followed by another and the new ideas became the statute of European countries.

The alleged disenfranchisement of peoples and men was nothing but the disenfranchisement of the Jews. The alleged spring of the peoples was nothing but the spring of the Jews. So much so, in fact, that such words only have meaning when used in reference to them.

All the anarchic developments of later democracies enabled the Jews to acquire greater influence and power. All the armaments imposed by the exacerbation of nationalism were a source of revenue for them. The taxes that ruined nations and men enriched the Jews, who were their ultimate recipients via the state. The Jews became the universal creditors. Tax hikes merely served to pay off some of the ever-mounting debts, while automatically increasing the wealth, power, and influence of Israel. Clearly, this went to the detriment of the entire human race, which fell directly or indirectly in debt to the Jews without realising it.

The wars and revolutions that continued spreading after 1848, which became an increasing burden on European countries, were but the finest of all financial operations for the Israelite gold peddlers.

The Jews may have no industries, forests, castles, or factories, but they own the stocks, sponsorships, and letters of credit for them. Those who offend the Jews' envious gazes by showing off their own riches are in fact nothing but the Jews' tax-payers, one way or the other. At the same time, these individuals serve as lightning rods attracting blasts of popular rage upon themselves and their tangible assets, thereby diverting this rage from the Jew, who remains undetectable and free from responsibility.

When the gap between the wealth of businesses and the misery of the masses will grow too conspicuous or shocking, people will explain – by resorting to scientific arguments – that the problem is a widespread economic crisis, and not simply the transfer of cash into Jewish pockets.

This process unfolded relatively slowly in the first half of the nineteenth century, but since 1848 everything has been moving along with giant steps in this direction – uninterrupted progress, indeed.

The simultaneous revolutions of 1848 were exceptional events in both economic and political terms: Jewish businessmen never made a better investment.

If in certain respects men came to enjoy a greater level of comfort after these revolutions, this was due to the industrial application of science, which has nothing to do with capitalist practices or democratic methods.⁴

The juridical disenfranchisement of the Jews and their acquisition of equal civil rights went to the detriment of their new fellow citizens. Something similar may be found in the *Arabian Nights*, which tells of a fool who opened a bottle containing an evil genie. When the genie was released from the pressure of the bottle, it grew to such a size that it ended up occupying the entire world and ruling over humanity.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, all professions, careers, and fields of action – with the exception of certain honorific offices of no social importance – were opened up to the Jews, who rushed to occupy them *en masse*. They fiercely competed with the Christian flock and gradually took over all the best posts.

Russia alone remained closed to them. The outrageous case of Russia thus became the favourite subject matter of all Jewish-made European literature and thought. There is less talk of Russia nowadays – when the state of the country is enough to make one's hair stand on end – than there was between 1848 and 1914. This in itself should make us think and realise that, according to modern parlance, a state is liberal, tolerant, and enlightened when it honours the Jew, even if it oppresses all its other citizens and is headed by a new Nero. A state, on the contrary, is regarded as despotic, oppressive, and backward, and elicits feelings of outrage, as soon as it seeks to defend itself against the Jew, even if all its other citizens have no reason to complain.

Israel was never to forgive Russia. As soon as it had attained its goals in western and central Europe, it directed its efforts against the one enemy still standing.

If the year 1848 was the equinox of the Jew, it was followed by countless April showers, with great temperature variations. Still, it took about twenty years for relations in Europe to conform to the new order.

Leaving aside the case of France, where the monarchy of the Orléans was brought down, this first historical attempt at a pan-European revolution initially seemed to have failed, since the old order was re-established.

The overall plan, however, had been well prepared: no conservative state was to deal with its neighbour's revolution, for each had a revolution of its own to deal with. Russia alone was free, but had its eyes fixed on Constantinople, where the 'sick man' was growing sicker and sicker. The Tsar focused all his diplomatic efforts on the attempt to ensure his succession and thus become the executor of Peter the Great's will. Britain held Russia in check. While neither side wished to wage war, the situation remained tense.

This tension was exploited by the parties of subversion, which were hoping to avert the possibility that Nicholas might deal with the revolutions in central Europe.

The Tsar never intervened in this area, not even in Prussia, where the ruler – his brother-in-law – was facing a difficult situation. Still less did the Tsar consider intervening in Italy, which was far away.

While in his heart he was utterly foreign to liberalism, Nicholas I did not possess Metternich's genius, nor his overall view of the historical chain of causes and effects. A greater soldier than statesman, and a ruler so authoritarian as to ignore all advice, the Tsar only saw what was before his eyes and never considered the possibility that the fire consuming Europe might envelop his own empire.

Nicholas I, the man before whom everyone from the White Sea to the Black, and from the Carpathian Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, trembled, believed his empire to be made of iron. He refused to admit – or even consider the possibility – that the Judaising liberals of the West he so deeply despised had already started digging his descendants' graves.

He behaved like our contemporaries do and like Bismarck did (who nonetheless is considered to have been a great statesman). But the behaviour of Nicholas I is more excusable, since he lacked the same level of experience.

The Tsar was certainly capable of crushing the revolution in 1848, for he was still sure of the unfailing loyalty of his troops. However, he committed the terrible mistake of not doing so, and the price paid for this was the very existence of his dynasty and empire. The revolution of 1848 was the egg from which the revolution of 1917 was born: for historical events are always interconnected. Regrettably, the only people aware of this are the Jews, and herein lies their great superiority.

In the life of individuals, families, and nations, there are certain supreme moments in which the future rests in one's hands.

History might have taken a different course, had Nicholas I – whose empire had not yet been affected by the surrounding putrefaction – resolutely stood up as the representative of absolute authority in 1848, just as Napoleon III was to do a short time later for the principles of the French Revolution. Short-sighted people would have accused the Tsar of engaging in a useless war. From a contingent point of view, it would no doubt have been useless for Russia, but from the point of view of the philosophy of history – as may be judged today – it would have been a war of salvation both for his own country and for Christian humanity.

Only Nicholas I could have intervened and crushed the infernal conspiracy. What he did, however, was merely stifle one of its local symptoms: the revolution in Hungary.

A Russian army led by General Paskevitch got the better of it. The insurrection capitulated and the holy crown of Saint Stephen was returned to its legitimate holder, the Emperor of Austria.⁵

This act put the government of Vienna back in power, when for a moment it had been thrown into confusion by the occurrence of simultaneous revolts across its domain. The movement was temporarily quelled, but the impulse had been given by then and would never come to a halt.

Politically, Metternich had no voice. An old man disheartened at witnessing the triumph of what he hated and feared the most in his last days, this great European – the last statesmen to have envisaged Europe as an orderly and united whole – had in a way been buried by the ruins of his own edifice, the Holy Alliance. Only the memory of it survived. Its hour had come and the only man capable of fully grasping the events of the century had nothing to look forward to but death.⁶

The old emperor Franz had died. After the short reign of the weak Ferdinand, Franz Joseph – whom our generation has come to know as the patriarch of Europe – ascended his ancestors' throne at the age of eighteen. He hadn't had the time to acquire much experience, for he had been caught in the midst of events arising out of democratic chaos that were even less intelligible to the men of his day than they are to us.

This young man, who had been raised according to the traditional principles of the Hapsburg household, was most disconcerted by the first encounter he made with the phenomenon of democracy on the threshold of adulthood. The impression it created must have been like that of an upside-down house painted by some extravagant artist trying to be original and shocking by inverting all established values. Franz Joseph's reaction may easily be imagined, especially because democracy at the time was still something new that found its only precedent in the French Revolution, a frightful nightmare which still haunted people's imaginations.

People no more realised at the time than they do today that this was an attack mounted by a minority as small as the ruling elite, and seeking to replace it. The so-called People was regarded as an actual entity which plotters and adventurers who were in the pay of capitalist anonymity claimed to be representing.

The new Chancellor of the Empire, Charles Philip, Prince of Schwarzenberg, was less inspired than his brilliant predecessor and took the dangerous path of concessions and compromises. A similar approach will never satisfy an enemy who is insatiable by definition: it will merely show one's fear of him, and thus make him all the more demanding and arrogant. One cannot claim to know what impertinence is until one has witnessed democratic arrogance and heard the unrestrained words of the blithering maniacs who claim to embody the mute and indifferent people.

This regime based on half-measures lasted several years. Finally, a parliamentary constitution was introduced.

The Austrian state started down a slippery slope. The Jews were assigned full civic rights. All paths, except those within the imperial court, were opened to them. From this moment onwards, the Jews anonymously began playing a conspicuous and dire role by hiding – as they are wont to do – behind the fetish of the 'people'.

The party of the French Revolution – which should not be confused with France as a country – thus celebrated a new victory. It did so in Vienna, the 'Kaiserstadt' which was regarded as the sanctuary of feudalism and which had been the cradle of the Holy Alliance.

In Austria, however, despite political changes, the economic and social structure remained imbued with the feudal spirit. The great noblemen remained economically independent of capitalism and continued to hold far greater prestige in the eyes of the masses than the bureaucrats and politicians. Besides, on both sides of the Leitha, it was the heads of great families of impeccable lineage who made up the Upper Chambers, which were known as the Lords' Chambers. Things continued this way until the Great War, much to the indignation of all 'generous and enlightened souls'.

Austria and Hungary, not unlike Prussia and the rest of Germany, showed themselves more reluctant to embrace democracy than France had been, and Russia was destined to be in the future. No Louis XIV or Richelieu, no Ivan the Terrible or Peter the Great, had sapped the lifeblood of patriarchal feudalism and domesticated the landed aristocracy. Gradually, almost everywhere except in Austria, this nobility had been drawn towards the royal courts, thus losing touch with the countryside it had once ruled over. In France and Russia this aristocracy was replaced to a far greater degree than in Austria or Germany by paid officials with no roots in the country and ready to serve the highest bidder.

The victory of subversion, while striking, was only partial. Planning to proceed with order, as usual, subversion was satisfied with what it had accomplished and left the rest up to its ally: time.

Things would have been much easier if republican and parliamentary regimes had already been flourishing in Europe in that age. It would have been enough, then, with the help of the press and some propaganda, to fabricate the desired public opinion and instil it in the sovereign people, which at that point could have been exploited to demolish the state.⁷ Demagogues devoted to the cause would have occupied ministerial seats. By financial means, they would have nourished certain dispositions, giving the impression they were simple and spontaneous ones. This is how international capitalism manages to have all the wars it desires and prevent those it does not want.

In order to implement this process, however, two things are required: first of all, complete freedom of the press, whereby no authority has the right to muzzle the press, not even when the salvation of the nation is at stake; and secondly, a republican democratic regime, in which the weak men in power have only a casual relation with their ministerial portfolio. The only permanent and hereditary ties these politicians have are with their own portfolios, or rather wallets, which is why they will say: 'After me, the deluge – as long as I can take enough "dough" on board Noah's Ark for my family and me.'⁸

A similar point of view is more of an exception in the case of kings, and especially absolute monarchs, for the simple reason that the state represents their personal fortune, power, wealth and glory, as well as their descendants' heritage. It is particularly rare among the landed aristocracy of the old sort, whose traditions are not nomadic like the Ark of the Covenant of the Old Testament. The fortune of these nobles consists of a sum of elements drawn from the national territory: it is not mobile and is not based on credit, which is to say on debts that make it dependent on creditors. The above point of view, however, is quite logical and normal for scheming politicians with no links to the soil or

history: men risen out of God knows where, only to disappear with their pockets full after having carried out the tasks allotted to them by God knows whom.

To behave dishonestly towards his own country, a nobleman – not to mention a king – must be dishonest to the point of selflessness and stupidity, something rare indeed.

To behave honestly, a ‘Tartempion’⁹ of democracy brought into power by an anonymous clique that collected him from a barn – if not from a dunghill – must be honest to the point of selflessness and self-sacrificing heroism.

This is also an infrequent case: men like Cincinnatus¹⁰ are the exception. Besides, even when they are to be found, it is not they who are brought to power and given any credit.

This is why political regimes ruled by dishonest men of the above sort are so warmly praised by the men of ‘progress’ – whose alleged progress is merely the powerful leverage they exert to the detriment of the blind masses.

But up until 1848, this golden age of democracy had yet to dawn.

¹ Evola adds, ‘Israel Enters into Action’.—Ed.

² Evola has ‘plebeian nationalisms’.—Ed.

³ Evola has ‘Jacobin nationalism’.—Ed.

⁴ The previous two paragraphs are not included in Evola’s edition.—Ed.

⁵ The 1848 revolution in Hungary expanded to become a war for liberation from the Hapsburgs. Russia intervened at Franz Joseph’s request, and invaded Transylvania in April 1849, although the Russian forces were soundly defeated by a Hungarian army under the command of the Polish-born General Józef Bem. The Russians sent a larger force in during the summer and were victorious the second time.—Ed.

⁶ Evola omitted the last sentence from his edition.—Ed.

⁷ The original French has ‘another’ in place of ‘the state’.—Ed.

⁸ In French this is a pun, since *portefeuille* means both political portfolio as well as wallet. In Italian, *portafogli* can only mean wallet, causing Evola to use the word for ‘offices’ (*cariche*) the first time it occurs.—Ed.

⁹ In French, Tartempion serves the same function as ‘John Doe’ in English, to designate an anonymous male person.—Ed.

¹⁰ Lucius Cincinnatus (519-430 BC) was a Roman consul who was elected dictator of Rome in 458 during time of war. He was successful, and became a hero to the Romans.—Ed.

Napoleon III: An Ally of World Subversion

In the historical period we are focusing on, subversion had the tremendous luck of finding a powerful ally who could exercise the right to intervene in the domestic affairs of other countries. He did so in a way opposite to the way Metternich had intended it, namely in the name of a new principle of international solidarity: mutual solidarity among nationalist and democratic states bent on freeing one another from the yoke of alleged traditional tyrannies.

This ally and selfless champion of democratic solidarity based on the ‘immortal principles’ was Napoleon III, who emerged in France thanks to the 1848 revolution. Yet before undertaking any new tasks, subversion more prudently sought to prevent the possibility of there being any reversal of fortune. Up until 1848, it had dared to ignore the wild card represented by the Tsar of all Russia. This monarch, who had hardly been enlightened by the torch that Weishaupt had passed on to Nubius, and Nubius was destined to pass on to Lenin,¹ had threatened to ‘spill the beans’: the sauce the Jew was preparing in order to poison all those who stood in his way.

Luckily for the Jew, this autocrat who continued to treat God’s Chosen People as rabble had only intervened in Hungary. While it had been possible to remedy this damage, the partisans of liberty on the march were never to forget the lesson they had learned.

Before having France intervene in Italy² in any way, it was necessary to avert the risk of any Russian intervention to reinforce Austrian defences. In other words, it was necessary to deliver a blow against the Russian Emperor alone, in order to immobilise and disable him. Then another blow would have been delivered against the emperor of Austria, who by then would have been completely isolated. The aim was to have only the revolutions occur simultaneously, while fostering divisions within the opposite front. It was a fine political strategy.

We shall not focus on all the various incidents of the Parisian revolution of 1848. Suffice it to know where it led to, after all the incoherent declamations that followed it: first, it brought a President of the Republic, namely Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. Then, through a plebiscite, Napoleon III became emperor – clearly, Emperor of the French, not of France; and by the will of the nation, not by grace of God.

It was Napoleon III’s ambition to complete his uncle’s work. But in order to complete any kind of work, one must first understand of what it consists. Now, ‘to understand is to equal’: the work of Napoleon the Great could only have been completed by Napoleon the Great, not by Napoleon the Lesser.

More than simply the work of Napoleon, *The Memorial of Saint Helena* is a product of the man’s disenchantment – which can easily be imagined, considering how he must have felt after having been abandoned by all the princes and great men of the world who had once been at his feet. Having been betrayed and even left by his own wife, an emperor’s daughter, Napoleon naturally turned back to his origins: the gospel of resentment preached

by the French Revolution. How different things had been on the day when Napoleon had placed the imperial crown on his own head with the momentous words: 'God gave it to me, woe to him who touches it.'

Why had he not said: 'The people gave it to me, and I shall keep it until the day it wants it back'?

What was the reason for the presence of the Pope at the consecration ceremony? Did the will of the people require it? This was very much in the tradition of Charlemagne and the Holy Roman Emperors, only with an added touch of pride, for while the latter had gone to Rome, Napoleon had personally summoned Rome. Still, his ceremony was hardly in the tradition of Robespierre.

Why had Napoleon married not just a blue-blooded princess, but the double grandniece of Marie Antoinette – a representative of the purest Catholic, feudal, aristocratic, and medieval tradition, the very opposite of that of the Revolution?

Why had he appointed arch-chamberlains and arch-seneschals in place of the chamberlains and seneschals of the *ancien régime*? What was the reason for all this royal pomp, which showed none of the republican simplicity enjoyed by Washington or Lincoln?³

If Napoleon hadn't fallen, he would have left a new feudal system of fiefs loyal to the crown, with generals' sons as the new neighbours of the old country noblemen.

But what about the principle of indivisible nationalities? Was it to be found in France (which extended beyond its ethnic boundaries), in the Confederation of the Rhine, in the Kingdom of Westphalia, in that of Naples, or in the Grand Duchy of Warsaw?

The truth is that it hadn't taken Napoleon long to throw his republican cloak out the window and don a mantle dotted with bees. It was only when he was forced to remove the latter that, now a lonely and abandoned man filled with bitterness, Napoleon addressed posterity from the rocks of Saint Helena as an obedient son of the Revolution. Up until that moment it was not the 'great achievements of the human spirit' that the great conqueror had sought.

Napoleon has sought to present himself as an heir of Charlemagne, not of the French Revolution. With his ambition growing with victory after victory, he had yearned for the honour of being Emperor of the West and not simply Emperor of the French – too modest a title for him, and one that, in any case, would no longer have fitted him. For Napoleon, nationalism never mattered.⁴

Napoleon certainly paid a great service to the revolutionary cause in Europe. But he did so unconsciously, without really intending to, only because almost all his officers and soldiers were old revolutionaries who carried the dust of the Revolution on their uniforms and boots, leaving traces of it in the capitals they marched through. The loyal subjects of emperors and kings saw their lords and princes being humiliated by the Great Upstart and his band of upstarts, as a consequence of which the old rulers lost much of their prestige.

It was no revolutionary, democratic, and nationalist dream which the new Caesar cherished for his son, who was bestowed the medieval – and in a way imperially international – title of King of Rome. This title alone is enough to reveal the real nature of Napoleon's thought, his *Memorial* being but the sour grapes of his resentment and bitterness.⁵ The title of King of Rome implied that its holder was a Roman emperor – a French Roman emperor, just as in the past there had been German Holy Roman Emperors; an emperor, nonetheless, who would have had the Pope as his chaplain and kings as his great vassals (who in turn would have had princes as their own vassals). This would have been a new feudal system: a pyramid with a summit – what had been missing to make the Middle Ages complete.

Such a grand view of history was too much for the limited intelligence of someone like Napoleon III. Ultimately he was nothing but a petty conspirator in the pay of the anonymous conspiracy that had brought him to power.

Incapable of grasping the real plans of Napoleon at work behind the events of the First Empire, his heir merely gave a literal interpretation to the manuscript which Napoleon had dictated to him by his own resentment and disenchantment at Saint Helena.

The parties of subversion made sure to interpret the manuscript for Napoleon III. They had already claimed the great name of Napoleon I for themselves in the aftermath of the events of 1815, along with the desire for revenge felt by the French. There was actually no reason for feeling vengeful, as the historical territory of France had not been mutilated. Only the French Revolution had been defeated with the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The subversive parties, however, put their subtle minds to work in an attempt to link the revolutionary idea to that of France, thereby confounding mediocre souls.

One of these mediocre souls bore the name of Napoleon and the surname of Bonaparte. The forces of subversion were very clever at exploiting this man by making a most particular – and indeed historically unprecedented – emperor of him. Napoleon III's mission was to fight kings and emperors (his new colleagues), to weaken the prestige of the monarchy in Europe, to disintegrate all empires, and to make the Revolution triumph everywhere, with all the implications this would have carried.

As a monarch, Napoleon III had a particularly lustrous court, teeming with title-holders and gold-spangled dignitaries. He conferred hereditary noble titles that included all the privileges of the old, traditional ones.⁶ As a matter of principle, he fought with fanatical zeal – to the point of making this the very purpose of his reign – against the principle underlying the privileges by virtue of which he ruled, and could hope to pass his throne on to his descendants.

This is a paradox that has hardly been seriously considered. Otherwise, people would soon have realised that something unusual was going on.

Precisely because they have seriously considered this matter, certain writers have reached the conclusion that Napoleon III was simply an agent of the occult circles that dominated society in his day. These circles brought him to the throne and kept him in power by means of invisible strings, the nature of which is unknown to us, but which established a

genuine form of servitude from which the emperor could not break free.

This may all sound a little far-fetched. But while it is a rather bold judgement, it is not unjustified.

It is certainly hard to understand how an emperor might have enthusiastically promoted democracy worldwide – the one thing that most went against his own *raison d'être* – and done so almost purely for the sake of art, so to speak, when such a policy damaged the interests of his own dynasty and country.

Speaking from his throne in the middle of the Atlantic, Napoleon I had proclaimed himself to be the 'Messiah of the Revolution'. Napoleon III was a man for all tasks: a tool to demolish walls. He owed his crown to the Revolution, which would take it back as soon as he had played his part. This part, for which Napoleon III had been raised out of nothing, he certainly played very well: for, as we shall see, he was ready to listen to the prompts which were whispered in his ear.

The first wall that needed to be demolished was Nicholas I. This unscathed champion of reaction – the only man who had successfully intervened in the past and who might have done so again in the future – hanged over the forces of subversion like a sword of Damocles.

The question was whether Napoleon III was strong enough on his own to bring down this formidable athlete, who was then at the peak of his power.

As if it had just fallen from the sky, in 1853 Napoleon found the ally he needed to pave the way for democracy and avert the danger that threatened it. Britain did not usually meddle in continental affairs and was interested in only one: that of the Ottoman Empire, Constantinople, and the Dardanelles. Its latent rival here was Russia.⁷

Unlike the countries of continental Europe, Britain had not witnessed any explicit revolutions. Instead, it had undergone a long phase of evolution, as imperceptible from the outside as it was profound on the inside. British institutions had apparently remained unchanged. The Crown was still there – indeed, its prestige was even on the increase – as were the Privy Chamber, the House of Commons, and the House of Lords. Still, these no longer retained their original significance. Everything had been democratically transformed, while remaining unchanged on the surface.

Let us also bear in mind that Britain was swarming with Masonic lodges. It is true that their mental, intellectual, moral, or even mundane and social level was far more elevated than that of continental lodges. But still, one should not forget that while Masonic lodges are often perfectly respectable places in themselves, they are particularly prone to becoming the passive recipients of progressive suggestions. Certain cells will thus become saturated with these influences, without most members of the lodge – including its honorary leaders, those adorning its façade and attracting outsiders – ever knowing about their role or presence.

In the age we are now discussing, a radical Liberal minister was in power in Britain. It has actually been found that he was under the control of the radical wing of his party. Its

head, Lord Palmerston, was Prime Minister, which is to say that he was the political leader of the United Kingdom. This was the same party as that which is now presided over by Lloyd George – himself a radical, i.e. more than just a Liberal. At the time, this party brought together pure liberals and radicals. Yet as the wheel of history has travelled quite a long way since Lord Palmerston's day, because of the distance that separates us from him, he now strikes us as being less of a subversive than Lloyd George.

Lord Palmerston and his radical circle naturally sympathised with the European revolutionary movement of 1848 and could not bear Metternich's policies, Nicholas I's attitude, and the Moscovite spirit of those years more generally.

Their aversion for Tsarism, which had little regard for the Chosen People and their ideals, was only Platonic at first. Things changed, however, as soon as a pretext was found that could bring British interests into play. This pretext – something rather insignificant in itself – would not have been enough for a conservative government, which would easily have found a way to come to an arrangement without sacrificing any of the country's interests. On the other hand, it was quite enough for Lord Palmerston to launch an offensive against the Russian Empire: for he was heeding the call of his blood. Lord Palmerston found an unexpected ally in Napoleon III – unexpected, that is, because the Turkish question may have been a good enough reason for Britain to attack, but certainly not France.

There may have been few grounds for serious conflict between France and Russia, but many could be found for conflict between Russian autocracy and the French Revolution. What more could be asked for?

¹ Evola adds this footnote: 'Jean Adam Weishaupt, born in Bavaria in 1748, was the founder of the so-called "Order of the Illuminati", a secret association of great historical importance, as it clearly illustrates the transformation of aristocratic and spiritual initiatory organisations into political, revolutionary, and subversive groups. "Nubius" was the pseudonym used by a mysterious figure who exercised considerable influence over early nineteenth-century secret societies, starting with the Italian Carbonari. Besides, it is likely that the name Weishaupt – meaning "White leader" – was itself a pseudonym.'

² Evola removes 'in Italy'.—Ed.

³ Evola omits this paragraph from his edition.—Ed.

⁴ Evola omits all but the first sentence of this paragraph.—Ed.

⁵ The previous sentence is omitted in Evola's edition.—Ed.

⁶ Evola omits the first two sentences of this paragraph.—Ed.

⁷ De Poncins is referring to the conditions which led to the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853.—Ed.

The First Wars for Democracy: The Crimean War¹

The war of 1853, known as the Crimean War, marked an important historical turning point for two reasons. First of all, because it signalled the final cancellation of the pact of the Holy Alliance and the closing – at the hands of its signatories – of the beneficial period of international peace it had brought. Secondly, because the war coincided not merely with the cancellation of the Holy Alliance, but with the very negation of the principle on which it was founded and its replacement with an opposite one through a complete reversal of values. The Crimean War was an event and a symptom with no historical antecedent: it was a war for democracy, and ultimately nothing other than that. For the first time in history, two monarchies acted as the mercenary champions of a sweeping revolution that transcended the apparently national boundaries of the French Revolution.

Strictly speaking, the wars of the French Revolution had not been democratic ones. They had been defensive wars waged by France, which happened to be in the thralls of revolution at the time. The Napoleonic Wars had been fuelled by the all-consuming ambition of a great conqueror who thirsted after glory and power. The war of 1853, by contrast, was the first openly and genuinely democratic war in history. As we know all too well, it was not the last.

For the first time, young men from good families² killed one another, not in the name of their countries, princes, or any inborn feeling, but so that scum on both sides, instigated by the tumultuous Jew, could tread on their corpses.

It took what is mockingly referred to as ‘freedom’ to make such bitter irony possible, with its repression of people’s genuine personalities. People would once have given their lives for what they loved. Now that they are ‘free’, they are forced to have themselves killed, if needs be, for the devil himself or the interests of Jewish capitalism – which amounts to much the same thing. If they refuse to do so, they will be accused of being traitors to their country and possibly shot, as if one’s fatherland, Freemasonry, democracy, and the Jew were all one and the same thing.

The spokesmen of democracy and the so-called freethinkers cherish few illusions concerning the real meaning of the war of 1853. They see it not as a conflict among many others in history, one motivated by some issue with the Turks, but rather as the clash of two worlds and two basic dogmas: ‘that of the barbarian Christianity of the East and that of the young social faith of the civilised West’, to quote Michelet’s³ own words.

We should hasten to add that according to that way of thinking, Christianity is barbarous in Naples, Munich, or even Saint Peter’s Cathedral. Lodges, stock exchanges, and banks were to be the future temples of the ‘civilised’ West. Nicholas I was a ‘tyrant’ and ‘vampire’, as Metternich had been. There are some people whom one cannot disturb without being labelled a vampire, while there are others whom one is free to massacre by the thousands in the name of freedom without thereby ceasing to be a noble and generous person.

According to Michelet himself, this ‘was a religious war’ – what an accurate expression! – which called for ‘the death of hundreds of thousands of men’. It was thus necessary for Christians – for most of these men were not freethinkers, financiers, or Jews – to have themselves killed in order to destroy Christianity and pave the way for Bolshevism in the East and the ubiquitous spread of capitalism in the West.

The Crimean War – the work of capitalism, democracy, and their artificial product, modern nationalism⁴ – inaugurated this new method of warfare, which was destined to find its triumph in the World War.

Russia was unprepared for this conflict. How could it have not been? The Tsar and his ministers were men of the *ancien régime* whose political approach was based on the lessons history had taught them; they were not apocalyptic visionaries of the future, after Michelet’s fashion.

Things we have grown accustomed to by now, such as the ‘selfless’ wars waged by countries – especially monarchies! – for democracy or the profit of international capitalism⁵ were unintelligible to the followers of ‘barbarian Christianity’. What they saw was that in 1853 there was no good reason to trouble the lives of peoples, and that the reasons invoked, which fell outside the spectrum of ordinary causes for conflict, were an unprecedented novelty that utterly escaped their understanding.

No one in Russia was expecting any clash to occur in Crimea. Troops thus had to be moved across the whole of European Russia – a slow and difficult operation in an age when the country had few railways and all of its roads were either incomplete or in a state of disrepair.

In short, the army of Moscow, whose reputation following the events of 1813 was rather overinflated, were defeated, and the Tsar did not even make it to the battlefield, for he fell ill along the journey and died. According to the official version, he died of flu; according to the most common opinion, this proud and uncompromising man poisoned himself because he could not bear the thought of having been humiliated by democracy. Others still say he was poisoned.

With the death of Nicholas I, a living embodiment of Tsarism disappeared, and of all that by which democracy was most horrified. Yet, Nicholas I lived on in the hearts of his own people, who admired him as a true Tsar and lord. Adored by his soldiers, Nicholas I had been generous with those loyal to him but merciless in the fight against revolt, whose real significance in nineteenth century history he had grasped. Once, when the rumble of revolt had reached the windows of the Winter Palace, Nicholas I had stepped out on the balcony and shouted: ‘On your knees!’ The people had knelt before him: such was the authority which his bearing and voice commanded.

Nicholas I’s successor, Alexander II, half-heartedly professed a vague sort of liberalism. To the extent to which this is possible for an autocrat, he was well regarded by democrats, who only tolerate weak and irresolute monarchs. It was thus in the reign of Alexander II that the decay of the Empire began. It was destined to never end. All other obstacles having been removed, subversion was now to direct all its efforts against Russia.

The Congress of Paris was Napoleon III's triumph. People saw it as an act of revenge against the Congress of Vienna and for the French defeat at Waterloo. One would be hard put to find out just how and why this was considered to be the case, unless we are to reduce this whole triumph and revenge to the simple fact that the Congress was held in Paris. France was destined to receive much the same degree of satisfaction in 1919, in the aftermath of a bigger war for democracy.

This, then, is what France gained. Britain hardly fared any better. The rest went to democracy. It was democracy which really triumphed, for Nicholas I had never posed any real danger to France – only a serious threat to the Revolution.

¹ Evola entitles this chapter, 'The First Wars for the Occult Front: The Crimean War'.—Ed.

² Evola has, 'sons of the same family'.—Ed.

³ Jules Michelet (1798-1874) was a French historian and man of letters. He was very much an anti-clericalist and opposed to the pre-Revolutionary order of France.—Ed.

⁴ Evola has, 'the subversive and anti-traditional nationalism of modern times'.—Ed.

⁵ Evola omits, 'or the profit of international capitalism'.—Ed.

After Bringing Russia Down, the Revolution Directs Its Efforts against Austria

After having temporarily brought Russia down, all efforts were directed against Austria. The revolution made no mistakes about this country. Hatred, like love, is driven by an unfailing instinct when it comes to what is intrinsically one's opposite.

Austria was the most hated of all countries. It was the most visible embodiment of Catholicism, the *ancien régime*, the concept of personal property (as opposed to the social one of capitalism), the heritage of the Holy Roman Empire, and the ideal of a hierarchical ordering of Christendom under a single sceptre – in other words, an embodiment of all that was considered to be most barbarous. In short, Austria stood for the very opposite of the ideals of the Revolution: capitalism, democracy, and nationalism,¹ all three of which were utterly contrary to the Austrian and medieval worldview.

Now, Austria in the first half of the nineteenth century was a country of the *ancien régime*. The reason for this lay not simply in the fact that it was a political monarchy. Capitalism might, in theory, have contented itself with turning Austria into a monarchy ruled by bankers and financial traders. The country, however, consisted of a federation of self-sufficient economic monarchies governed by a sovereign who was a big landowner free of debts – in other words, an independent ruler. These monarchies were self-sufficient in that they made up for one another as concerns basic goods.

Trade, moneylending, and agiotage were to be found almost exclusively in the big cities – which were certainly not as big as those of today – yet only constituted a secondary feature of the economy. This was instead based – for individuals as much as for the state – on production, consumption, and exchange. The economic rulers of the country were the landowners, who were often industrialists as well, and produced most of the necessary foodstuff with the help of their farmers. There were no complaints, poverty, or strikes, first because this ruling class was patriarchal and its members – from father to son – were thus visible and personally accountable; and secondly, because these landowners had no fixed-term creditors ready to hold a knife to their throats. They were free from debts, while paying all of their taxes, for the state was relatively undemanding at the time, not being indebted as today's states are.

This is not to say that the Jew played no role, but simply that he did not take the lion's share – one big enough for the Lion of Judah.

In economic as well as political and social terms, Austria set the tone for the whole German Confederation, which was comprised of states which were all rather similar in this respect. They consisted of federations of big patriarchal landowners and industrialists under the paternal leadership of princes, archdukes, and kings – who were landowners and producers themselves. The latter received a just amount of taxes not for the enrichment of usurers, but for the upkeep of famous schools and universities, the police, the law courts, roads, and their small armies.

If Austria – albeit stripped of its Italian provinces – had taken the upper hand in Germany, this would have meant the establishment of a reactionary and anti-capitalist bloc based on feudal property ownership (or, rather, an updated version of it). This bloc would have cut Russia and the Balkan peninsula off from the Western democracies: it might thus have prevented the destructive infiltration of the ideas spawned by the French Revolution. The Catholic element, moreover, would have been predominant.

Austria had to be destroyed.

It was because of this goal that such great importance was assigned to the problem of national irredentism, which had previously been utterly non-existent.² We should not forget that in the first half of the nineteenth century, Austria was even more of a patchwork of different races and languages than at the beginning of the twentieth. It not only ruled – without granting any constitutions or autonomy – over Bohemia, part of Poland, Hungary, and Croatia; in other words, over a Magyar land and three Slavic ones with different languages; but it also controlled the whole of northern Italy: the Veneto, Lombardy, and Tuscany.

It was thus chiefly in pursuit of the above goal that the ingenious Jews – never to be caught off-guard – staked everything on nationalism, which they started fostering. The terrain chosen for their attack was Italy.

Italy was no doubt the most vulnerable area of the Hapsburg empire, especially because the peoples of the north of the peninsula were the heirs to democratic and republican traditions – which were instead prominently lacking in the central European regions.

Italian cities had been, for the most part, republican if not democratic. They had always fought against the German emperors. Traces of this remained in the local political temperament. They alone in Europe had professed a sort of patriotism or particularism that was less dynastic than civic, being reminiscent of the spirit of the ancient Mediterranean cities.

There were thus good reasons to expect the new ideas sparked by Napoleon and the French Revolution to be better received in Italy than elsewhere. Italy was the most vulnerable region of the Empire whose dissolution was so eagerly sought; at the same time, it was the most desirable victim according to the overall plan of subversion.

It was not so much by means of democracy and the ‘immortal principles’ as through nationalism that Austria had to be isolated as far as possible, so as to prevent her companions in misfortune from coming to her aid: for she alone would never have been capable of getting herself out of trouble. After demolishing Austria, there would have been plenty of time to think about what yet remained to be done about the other states.

Napoleon III fulfilled his task by declaring war against the Emperor of Austria, with no apparent grounds or provocation, for not even a vague reason was to be found that might somehow have concerned the future of France. Napoleon III simply declared war, as he had done with the Emperor of Russia, in order to complete the revolutionary work of 1848. The true and undeclared reason was the following one: the Catholic unity of the

Hapsburg state, which lay above all national and ethnic differences, was a relic of the Holy Roman Empire, a more limited expression and model of what the Holy Alliance was originally meant to be, but in practice never was. How could the enforcer of the lofty plans of the great Revolution not contribute to the disintegration of this hated vestige of the medieval order, which was considered so offensive in the age of progress?

A second democratic war was thus waged in the name of nationalism.

Austria was defeated and withdrew from Italy forever.³ It lost much of its power and prestige within the German Confederation, where Protestant Prussia now gained predominance.⁴

Two other ideals were weakened as a result of this war: the Catholic ideal of Christian political universalism, which yielded to the Protestant idea of nationalist separatisms; and the conservative and feudal ideal – as traditionally embodied by Austria – which yielded to democratic ‘progress’.

The King of Italy became yet another sovereign ruling ‘by the will of the nation’. In fact, he ruled by the will of subversive rather than purely national elements. Hence, the King found himself in an extremely difficult position: for as the heir to a Catholic dynasty of illustrious princes, he represented the conservative ideal; but at the same time, he embodied the very opposite ideal, as the involuntary enemy of the Pope – the source of all legitimacy – and the product of Masonic lodges and other secret societies.

Napoleon III himself faced much the same difficulties: for as the head of a Catholic country, he was forced to take the religious feelings of his subjects into account. He could not be a real ally of the new Italy of Mazzini and Garibaldi against Austria, and was even forced to stand in its way at the gates of Rome. His army, which had crucially contributed to the Italian victory and unification, was destined to prevent the Italians from gaining access to their new capital. Ultimately, in unifying Italy Napoleon III went against his own interest, something which he ought to have foreseen: for ‘a woman will easily forget what has been done for her, but will never forget what has not been done for her’. This proverb equally applies to nations. Napoleon III alienated the international front of the Right only to be abandoned by the international front of the Left. The latter, a habitual priest-basher, was now after the highest priest.

From this moment onwards, Napoleon III grew increasingly isolated. Seeing that he could follow her no further, the revolution searched for a different tool and found it in Prussia, in the person of Bismarck.

¹ Evola has, ‘collectivist nationalism’.—Ed.

² In Evola’s version, this paragraph, as well as the following five paragraphs, are substituted by a very different text, which is appended at the end of this chapter.—Ed.

³ In Evola’s version, for this paragraph he substitutes the following: ‘The real purpose of this war was not to favour genuine Italian patriotism, of the sort that strikes no compromise with the underground forces of the Revolution and Freemasonry; rather, it was to weaken the power and prestige of Austria within the German Confederation, where Protestant Prussia now gained predominance.’—Ed.

4 Concerning the backstage political events surrounding the Italian Risorgimento, it will be useful to refer to the documents included in Cretineau-Joly's *L'Église romaine et la Revolution* (Paris, 1859, vol. II). These clearly illustrate the role played by certain concealed Jews and Freemasons, who openly expressed contempt among themselves for the ideas of the Italian patriots. The latter they regarded as merely 'a means for turmoil worth holding on to'. Mazzini was considered a ridiculous and romantic conspirator who could never be introduced to the 'unknown superiors' of the Carbonari. Armed threats were even made against him, lest he should ever meddle in their business. The Carbonari were pursuing far greater aims. Against Rome they felt 'a healthy, cold-blooded, well-pondered, and most profound hatred that is worth more than all the fireworks and declamations of the politicians'. Their goal was to strike the very heart of traditional spiritual authority, with full awareness that this would have caused 'the fall of thrones and dynasties'. It would also be interesting to explore the role played by Britain and its Masonic leaders not only in France, but also in Italy – that is to say, with respect to the Italian secret societies operating for the revolutionary international under the guise of nationalist and patriotic groups. The aforementioned work contains some references to this. (Julius Evola)

EVOLA'S VERSION:

Austria, therefore, had to be destroyed.

We should not forget that in the first half of the nineteenth century, Austria was even more of a patchwork of different races and languages than at the beginning of the twentieth. It not only ruled – without granting any constitutions or autonomy – over Bohemia, part of Poland, Hungary, and Croatia; in other words a Magyar land and three Slavic ones with different languages; but it also controlled the whole of northern Italy: the Veneto, Lombardy, and Tuscany. The chosen tactic consisted of laying particular stress upon the previously non-existent issue of national irredentism, while closely linking the idea of nationalism to the liberal-democratic, anti-traditional, and anti-hierarchical one.

The chosen terrain for the first phase of the attack was Italy. Events unfolded as follows. In Italy, two traditions and heritages coexisted. The first one, the oldest and most genuine, was the Roman, Catholic, and aristocratic tradition. It found expression in Dante's Ghibelline⁵ and feudal Italy: that of the distinctly Italian princes who – starting from the Savoy and Monferrato families – had never hesitated to take up arms in defence of the rights of the Emperor and nobility at the time of the insurrection of the Italian city-states. The second tradition was the democratic one of these city-states, which was particularly strong in northern Italy. As a consequence, this region was one of the most vulnerable areas of the Hapsburg empire. What may rightly be described as the shadiest side of the Italian Risorgimento – which betrays the influence of the secret forces of world subversion – consists in the fact that the idea of Italian unification came to be exclusively associated with the second of these traditions. The ideas spread by Napoleon and the French Revolution became tools in the hands of Masonic lodges and the Carbonari. The greatest effort was spent in trying to make Italians forget about the first of the aforementioned traditions; in other words of their Roman, imperial, and aristocratic heritage. The stake here was two-fold: on the one hand, the aim was to open a crack in the empire that was to be demolished; on the other, it was to turn Italy into one of the most desirable victims according to the overall plan of subversion.

Napoleon III...

⁵ Ghibelline is a thirteenth century term which was originally coined to name the supporters of the imperial power of the Hohenstaufen throne against Papal authority. They were in conflict with the Guelphs, who favoured the rule of the Pope.—Ed.

Bismarck and the Transformation of Central Europe

Prussia had endowed itself with a less liberal constitution than the Austrian one. It too was a monarchy in which vestiges of feudalism survived and big landowners acted as small kings, having few links with the banks and stock exchanges. Yet the overall mindset of Prussia was no less open to new ideas, if for no other reason but the fact that it was a Protestant country and one in which – as in all other countries of the Reformation – Freemasonry flourished.

While both Austria and Prussia were monarchies ruled ‘by grace of God’, they differed considerably.

Already before the French Revolution, Frederick II – a friend of Voltaire’s and a generous patron of freethinkers – had stated that ‘the king is but the first servant of the state’. This had merely been a prince’s opinion, with no immediate practical consequences for his reign. Yet it is difficult to imagine this sentence coming from Hapsburg lips, or those of the man who claimed such things as ‘I am the state’, ‘I failed to wait’, and ‘the greatest person in my kingdom is whoever I might be speaking to, the moment I condescend to do so’. Likewise, it would have never passed the lips of Nicholas I or Franz Joseph.

This momentous sentence is part of the Masonic repertoire. It clearly illustrates the imperceptible spread of the ‘new ideas’ through cells whose affiliations remained utterly unknown. Berlin was overflowing with lodges. Some of them, such as the Royal Lodge of Prussia, were aristocratic ones in which – interestingly – Jews were not admitted. The latter were nonetheless represented by other cells imbued with their spirit.

The Royal Lodge of Prussia, like the British ‘Great Lodge’, was a salon attended by pure-blooded princes and the most prominent members of society, who would be subtly influenced by forms of propaganda carefully measured so as not to alarm them.

‘The prince, the first servant of the state’: apparently, there is nothing wrong with this claim. Did Christ himself not say much the same thing? ‘The Son of Man has not come to be served but to serve.’ Did Christ not wash the feet of the Apostles? But it was the popes and emperors who imitated this gesture of Christ, not the kings of Prussia, as it applied to living men and not abstractions such as the ideas of nation, society, and the state.

If princes are servants of the state – an elusive concept – rather than its lords, then they are no longer the servants of Christ the King or God, for the state itself becomes God. The capitalist and fiscal state truly is the reign of Mammon.

What we are approaching here is the establishment of a state that seeks to replace God by situating itself above all, in such a way as to identify itself with enslaving capitalism, hate-fuelled nationalism, and finally democracy (which refuses to serve God, serving the priests and people of Mammon alone).

At the dusk of ancient history, the Roman Emperor Constantine the Great had already sought to use Christianity for his own purposes. The Roman Empire passed away, but

Christianity endured, for what is greater and everlasting cannot serve what is lesser and transient. This causal value relation cannot be inverted. What Constantine had sought to accomplish with the great, positive force-idea of history,¹ Bismarck sought to accomplish with its great negative force-idea, Judaism, in the hope that this age-old current might be put to work 'for the King of Prussia'.

British statesmen of our day have acted in much the same manner, possibly in the belief that by reviving the Kingdom of Judea under the Union Jack they would be delivering a master stroke.

In all three cases, those who were hoping to seize were seized themselves. Nor could things have been any different. For neither Christianity nor Judaism (its antithesis) can be seized by the petty and contingent self-interest of any political regime or nation: for they represent the two leading force-ideas of history, not mere historical incidents.

Everything else converges towards these two currents and cannot seize either of them in the pursuit of personal or national goals.

The word 'Israel' means 'he who fights with God', he who is as strong as God. It was bestowed as a title on the patriarch Jacob, the common father of the Jewish race, following the Biblical dream in which he had seen himself caught in an endless fight against the Most High.

Has Bismarck – not to mention Lloyd George – ever dreamt anything as grand? It is rather unlikely, because everything suggests that these men were nothing but petty opportunists.

As strong as God!...

But let us not rush ahead of things. What we wish to show for the time being is that Bismarck was the first in Europe to rely on capitalism, which is nothing but a front for Jewry. Bismarck tried to 'take the bull by the horns' by turning a feudal state into a capitalist one. The state, which had hitherto been only a means to improve citizens' lives, became a goal in itself: a deity to be worshipped. Religion – Protestantism, in this case – simply became an accessory, as did the whole feudal structure, for the state was now a materialist one. It was also strongly nationalistic, as it sought to claim the nationalist outlook of 1848 for the exclusive profit of monarchical Prussia by stripping it of its democratic overtones. It was apparently successful at first.

Much discussion has been made about the political transformation of Germany under Bismarck's drive. There has been far less talk about the economic and social transformation of the country, which was more subtle but much more important.

No economic and social transformation as radical and rapid has ever taken place under the rule of one man. The city of Berlin alone witnessed its population increase tenfold. The same occurred in Hamburg and many other cities, particularly in the coal basin of the Rhineland.

The whole of Germany followed Prussia's example, even to the point of surpassing it.

The gentle balance between consumption and production was suddenly replaced by the circulation of goods and capital.

At the time of Bismarck's death, Germany was one of the countries with the most intense capitalist life. It was ahead of France and Britain in this respect, and almost on a par with the United States. When Bismarck had first come to power in Prussia, it had merely been a loose federation of feudal and agrarian states. Under the impulse of this Prussian squire, the idyllic motherland of *Hermann and Dorothea*² became a country of great financial wealth and proletarian misery.

Germany came to be known as a flourishing country that was growing richer and richer. In all good faith and with no exceptions, Germans seemed to be very proud of this. They never wondered why they themselves or those close to them were not growing any wealthier, when the country – their country – was meant to be taking such giant steps forward in terms of economic progress. They never wondered why the need had suddenly arisen to expand abroad or – if this was not possible – to emigrate en masse to the Americas or other places.

These questions were answered by simply invoking overpopulation. There was no doubt some truth to the issue of sudden overpopulation, but what was its cause? The problem had emerged in just a few decades, when for centuries no such development had ever threatened Germany's existence. Was it the various applications of modern science that were making men more prolific? The excess population might have gradually flowed towards Russia, whose government at the time did not hinder as much as favour such movements. Nor would Germany have really lost part of its inhabitants, for it would merely have waited for Russia to turn – as one might have expected – into an area of German penetration. By colonising empty Russian space, these emigrants would have acted as colonisers and, in a way, the pioneers of German influence. The empire of the Tsars was already sprawling with German colonies at the time – flourishing colonies that extended as far as the Volga.

The wretchedness of the German masses was in fact due not so much to overpopulation – which was merely invoked as a pretext – as to the sudden and extreme intensification of production. This was geared not towards consumption, which it far surpassed, but only towards trafficking, commerce, and agiotage, all for the benefit of loan sharks. As the latter financed shipping ventures and industries, they aimed to increase these businesses in order to have more to finance. Hence, they did their best to either directly or indirectly discourage the colonisation of Russia, as they had little to gain from it.

As for the state, it sank deeper and deeper into debt as it grew in military strength. It became more and more indebted towards these people, to whom it was forced to pass on most of the revenue it acquired in the form of taxes from its citizens. The latter, in turn, were forced to come up with artificial means to meet their ever-expanding needs: they plunged into the whirlpool of business, so that the state might be able to pay off its creditors' interests. Germany automatically dragged its allies and potential enemies into this vicious circle. The whole of Europe thus became a field open to capitalism, through which the Jew obtained the money he needed to finance future wars and revolutions.

Bismarck is the man who bestowed the crown of unified Germany upon Wilhelm I. Yet – and this was something far more serious – he was also one of the men who contributed the most to crowning Mammon as King of the Earth, at a time in which Marx and Lassalle, followed by Liebknecht and Bebel,³ were carefully observing this march of progress as it swept across the centre of Europe.

Bismarck certainly wasn't a democrat in the most obvious and ordinary sense of the term. By birth he belonged to a class which was particularly loyal towards the Prussian monarchy, that of the small landed gentry of Prussia. He was therefore a fervent royalist. But his royalism was of a strictly Prussian sort and only became German when Prussia itself turned into Germany; it was never European and historic, as Metternich's royalism had been.

Unlike Metternich, Bismarck did not see the presence of two international and historic fronts engaged in a struggle that had been going on for generations. He did not realise that Europe was about to become a single body whose various organs would increasingly react against one another.

All he saw was the ready profits monarchical Prussia could make by becoming a tool of ubiquitous capitalism, even to the detriment of the monarchical ideal. Bismarck was a great Prussian but a small European.

He knew that the monarchy was a point of strength and wanted it for his own country; but for the same reason he also wanted liberalism for the potential enemies or rivals of Germany, as this would have been a point of weakness and inferiority for them. All countries, in fact, represented potential enemies, as Germany was 'above all'.

Bismarck humiliated and weakened Austria, this citadel of the feudal nobility.

He fought against Catholicism and the Holy See, which is to say against the very principle behind divine right. He called this fight *Kulturkampf*, the fight for civilisation! Is this not the language of the men of 'progress' at home in Masonic lodges?

Bismarck contributed to the republicanisation and democratisation of France, in order to humiliate and demean this great country.

As for his own country, Bismarck turned feudalism, which had been its very social frame, into nothing but mere pretence. He replaced it with state bureaucracy, which is what Richelieu⁴ had done in France, forgetting that a mere turnover of people would have been enough to turn the system into state democracy or socialism.

Bismarck, in other words, fell under the spell of imperialist capitalism.

The reason for this is the fact that, blinded by his nationalist pride, he trusted Prussia to be exceptionally immune to certain influences.

Bismarck drove his own country – and in doing so all others too – down the road of militarisation, to the point that universal conscription, which is to say armed masses, became the rule throughout Europe. Bismarck was only naively seeking to increase the military power of Germany *vis à vis* its neighbours. What he failed to realise was that

these neighbours would have followed Germany, and hence that the balance of power was destined to remain substantially the same. The balance which did change, in Germany as elsewhere, was that which concerned the possibility of class war. If there had been no excuses for any European statesman worthy of his name to ignore this threat in the latter half of the nineteenth century, there were even less in the final quarter of the century.

In much the same way, the Romans in the age of decadence had taught the barbarians who made up their legions the science of war, only to let them return to their homes and prepare to invade, pillage, and conquer the Empire.

The arms race, which grew enormous, forced the state to adopt a broad tax policy with the sole aim of paying off the interests from its loans. This policy led to more and more debts, the sum of which could no longer be recouped because it had been swallowed up by expenditures of no benefit to anyone except ubiquitous international Jewry. Ever-new expenditures were made, so that the private wealth of individuals – who were becoming increasingly indebted to the Jews through the state – soon dwindled: once solid and tangible, it now vanished into the coffins of the anonymous creditor,⁵ in the form of easily transferable gold and notes.⁶

Bismarck's overall policy might have been excusable or even normal a few centuries earlier, for kingdoms back then had no internal enemies. Or even when they did, these were not permanent enemies, but only contingent ones: each acted for his own self-interest, and there was no international front with national branches following a general strategic plan under a common inspiration.

Emperors then were free to quarrel with popes; kings with one another and their great vassals; and prelates with princes: for there was no formidable and omnipresent common enemy plotting everyone's ruin. A similar enemy, however, was already in existence in Bismarck's day and asked for nothing better than to switch allies at the right moment, so as to gradually destroy them all by driving one against the other until it remained the only winner on the battlefield, without actually having to run any risks in person.

A similar policy was simply suicidal after 1848, or even the French Revolution. But such was the policy of a man who had no doubt been a sincere conservative and royalist – someone reactionary and absolutist at heart – and which history would have us describe as a genius.

Either Bismarck was nothing but a false reactionary, a conscious tool of subversion who behaved like Judas towards the *ancien régime*, in which case he really did give proof of genius (but this scenario is frankly impossible to assume); or his alleged genius merely consisted of being the most unlikely fool of the century. In this respect, Bismarck far outdid Richelieu. In demolishing feudalism, the latter stripped the Kingdom of France down to the bone, so to speak, in order to bring about the rise of a king who could claim 'I am the state'. Precisely because of this claim, the state was all the more easily guillotined later in the person of its King. Still, Richelieu had not experienced almost a century of revolutionary strategies.

Bismarck proved all the more foolish because he possessed undeniable intelligence and

shrewdness. These virtues, however, remained enclosed within the narrow boundaries set by the contingent ambitions of the Hohenzollern and the self-serving interests of Germany. Within these boundaries, Germany was regarded as being not simply ‘*über alles*’, meaning above everything – which would have been understandable from a German perspective – but beyond all: sheltered, that is, from the currents that made all parts interdependent, and thus situated outside of universal history.⁷

If Bismarck had been a genuinely great man – or even just an egoistically but intelligently great patriot – and if he had possessed the sharp foresight of a genius, he would have realised that a future for his overcrowded and congested fatherland was to be found in Russia. With its fertile and uncultivated fields, Russia would have been capable of feeding twenty Germanies for a whole century. Its vast territory concealed unimaginable riches and all the raw materials one might have wished for. The future of Germany was not to be sought for in over-industrialisation, which was destined to provide only temporary relief, and which actually worsened the country’s congestion in the long run and made socialism an increasingly likely scenario.⁸

The penetration of Russia might have taken place pacifically, for the country needed the kind of capacity to organise which was possessed by its neighbour, just as Germany needed the materials to be found on Russian soil. The two monarchical countries – with their related dynasties, which were bound by traditional ties of friendship – had every reason to get along with one another. A mutual alliance between them would have represented a formidable barrier or even force of attack against the democratic tide.

Wilhelm II not only worsened Bismarck’s mistakes, but even failed to follow him where he had been more inspired.

A characteristic of real political geniuses is their highly developed foresight: a sort of double vision. These men are capable of discerning what the Gospel calls ‘the signs of the times’, in other words what is essential and permanent, which they are careful not to confuse with what is only accessory, contingent, and accidental.

What was essential and permanent in the nineteenth century was the implacable antagonism not between two nations, but between two superimposed worlds: the upper world, which continued to lie under the influence of traditional Christianity, and the lower world, which was either consciously or unconsciously under the occult hold of Freemasonry and imperialist, militant Judaism. The latter concealed itself by taking the two-fold form of capitalism, and was opposed to personal ownership, and democracy – bourgeois at first and later socialist – which opposed legitimate authority.

The lower world was internationally united in thought and deed: ‘No enemy on the Left’. The upper world was divided by nationalism: *France d’abord*, *Deutschland über alles*, ‘Rule Britannia’. Hence the manifest inferiority of the latter of these worlds. Given such conditions, things could have gone no differently.

Like all of his contemporaries, bar none, Bismarck found it easier to act as an opportunist; in other words, not to go against the historical current created by the forces of subversion but to follow it, seeking to exploit this current in order to fulfil his contingent

ambitions and those of his country. As Bismarck was without a doubt the most skilled, crafty, and resourceful diplomat of his age, he managed to outdo all his colleagues as far as opportunism went, and achieved brilliant success, while unconsciously playing the game of international subversion. Clearly, the latter had no intention of losing Bismarck, as it had lost Metternich and Nicholas I, who had stubbornly gone against its current. On the contrary, it fully supported Bismarck, and this is the reason why his name has lived on as that of a winner, as has that of the later ruler Edward VII.

Metternich and Nicholas I have instead gone down in history as losers.

The greatest of all the sons of men, Christ, He whom even unbelievers regard as more than just a genius, was also defeated. More than anyone else Christ went against the current created by the ancestors of modern subversion; and it is for this reason that his Church, which is two thousand years old, enjoys the unique privilege of eternal youth.

Bismarck thus paid a greater service to the revolutionary cause than Napoleon III. Bismarck's work was only made possible by the weakening of Austria, which had been brought about by the 1848 movement first and then Napoleon III.

To the very end, Napoleon III remained loyal to the Revolution. Not satisfied with having unified Italy to the detriment of Austria, he did nothing to prevent Germany from unifying, again to the detriment of the same country.

It did not take great political acumen to foresee that a unified Germany under the leadership of a militarised Prussia would have constituted a far greater threat to France from the east than a pacific Germany divided into small autonomous states – each concerned with its age-old particular interests – under the vague suzerainty of a remote Austria comprised of a heterogeneous population.

Confident of Russian neutrality, Germany had no serious rivals in Europe except for Napoleon III. The latter stood isolated and could not rely on Russia, which he had humiliated in Crimea merely for the benefit of democracy; nor could he count on Italy, for this country he had unified in the name of nationalism could not forgive him for defending Rome despite this ideal. Napoleon III could rely even less on the idolatrous democracy that was now leaving him for Bismarck, the man destined to lend a new impulse to the ever-advancing march of 'progress'.

Napoleon III's turn had come, then. Again, a pretext was easily found. If it hadn't been the famous Ems telegram,⁹ it would have been something else. It is difficult to understand why certain historians like to waste so much time discussing such minor details.

The decision was taken to go to war. The German army was ready, but the French one was not. The European chessboard favoured Prussia as the power that had given a new impulse to international Jewish capitalism.

A German army of half a million well-armed and disciplined soldiers – the greatest military force Europe had seen since Napoleon I's campaign of 1812 – entered French territory.

The main French army, led by Napoleon III himself, was surrounded and forced to surrender. The Emperor was made a prisoner of war. The two other French armies, led by Napoleon III's generals, met much the same fate. The King of Prussia, accompanied by all the German princes and sovereigns, laid siege upon Paris.

The hybrid monarchy which had sacrificed the country's interests to those of the Revolution fell victim to the very Revolution it had once cherished.

Napoleon III was a strange monarch, of a sort that is hardly to be found in contemporary history – even among usurpers and parvenus, for while the latter usually try to conceal their origins, it was as if Napoleon III felt proud of his own, and only held the throne in order to demolish all monarchies – ultimately, including his own. The Second Empire approached the form of a secular republic, to the point of almost coinciding with it. For all its deceiving pomp, it was the regime of democracy and freethinking.

[1](#) In French, *idée-force* refers to an idea which becomes a driving force of history.—Ed.

[2](#) An epic poem by Goethe which describes German refugees during the French occupation of parts of the Rhineland in 1792, during the French Revolution.—Ed.

[3](#) Karl Liebknecht (1871-1919) and August Bebel (1840-1913) were the founders and leaders of the Social Democratic Party in Germany; Liebknecht later founded the Communist Party of Germany.—Ed.

[4](#) Cardinal Richelieu (1585-1642) was a clergyman who became the chief advisor to King Louis XIII in 1624. Seeking to centralise political power in the King, he weakened the powers of the nobility and had their fortresses destroyed, in order to make rebellions against the crown more unlikely.—Ed.

[5](#) Evola adds, 'and the Jew'.—Ed.

[6](#) It will be worth quoting the following words which Metternich spoke in 1849 and which once again show how prophetic his vision was: 'In Germany, the Jews play a prominent role and are class revolutionaries. Jewish writers, philosophers, poets, orators, and bankers carry the weight of their ancient infamy within their minds and hearts. They will become a real plague for Germany... Still, they are probably destined to meet an ominous fate' (quoted by I. Within, *The Trail of the Serpent*, 1936, p. 93). (Julius Evola)

[7](#) Evola omits this last sentence.—Ed.

[8](#) One must acknowledge, then, that Bismarck set certain limits to this policy of all-out industrialisation, for which his successor, Wilhelm II, is to be held more responsible. (de Poncins)

[9](#) On 13 July 1870, the French ambassador met with King Wilhelm of Prussia in Ems to deliver a demand from his government that he would never allow a Hohenzollern to become a candidate for the then-open throne of Spain, which would pose a strategic threat to France. The Kaiser remained noncommittal. Bismarck, after having received a report of the conversation, edited the report to make the meeting appear much more confrontational than it had actually been, and then released it in a telegram to the media. Per Bismarck's designs, this telegram angered the French and led them to declare war on Prussia.—Ed.

The Commune and the Eternal Hatred¹

The death of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte was hardly a great loss for France. But who was to be his successor?

The infernal machine fuelled by international gold which continued to operate in the dark underground of nineteenth-century European thought had visibly governed France for two decades, leading the country to unsheathe its sword beyond its borders. Nor did the machine come to a halt under the subsequent 'enlightened' regime, which reeked so strongly of the 'French Revolution'.

A new version of the machine was about to be launched: a considerably perfected one, to match the 'progress' which the 'immortal principles' had made – like wine stored in a canteen – over the past eighty years.

Was France not to continue bearing the torch it had carried in 1789? Is it not the case even today that many Frenchmen are still proud to be the first to implement Israel's plans?

And yet, the torch of 1871 could not be the same as that of 1789. The 'immortal principles' developed in Year 1, 2, and 3 of the Jacobin age² had turned into commonplace statements in European thought. An unprecedented innovation is what was needed, a new Parisian trend. It was found in the proletarian revolution, something Europe had never witnessed before.

The French Revolution had been the first revolution of the bourgeois and middle class – what is historically known as the Third Estate.

The Commune of Paris was the first revolution of the proletarian class, which until that moment had remain largely behind the scenes. It was the first historical embodiment of the dictatorship of the proletariat – a short-lived and quickly suppressed attempt to express this unprecedented form of subversion.

As the advent of the Fourth Estate, the Commune represents a step forward from what had come before it. Hence, it marks a date in the evolution of the spirit of revolt. All the pontiffs of contemporary subversion, from its socialist and Communist phase, are unanimous in stating so. The greatest among them, Marx and Lenin, have ostentatiously rejected all links with bourgeois, republican, and democratic revolutions such as those of 1789 and 1848, regarding them as simply a means and starting points rather than as goals in themselves. By contrast, they all claim to be the direct heirs to the Paris Commune, even when they criticise its technical failures. All, without exception, have bowed before it as if it were a sort of leader, devoting countless speeches, booklets, and books to it. The Commune provided a foretaste of the Bolshevik revolution. Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, Kautsky, Lawrof, and many others have discussed this point in their polemical tracts.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that the Paris Commune was a spontaneous movement – a mistake people make with all revolutions.

Again and again we find men – hundreds of thousands of them – who are so naive as to

believe that things can emerge spontaneously out of nothing without anyone's intervention. It is easy to realise what a philosophical absurdity and challenge to common sense this is. This is especially true in an allegedly scientific age, in which people should know that even those processes which were previously believed to be automatic and regulated by the abstract laws of nature – such as bodily decay, illness, old age, and so-called natural death – are in fact determined by concrete living agents, namely bacilli and toxins, which operate toward those ends. Without these agents there would be no decay, fever, decrepitude, or death: while invisible to our eyes, they are nonetheless real.

The same applies to society (i.e., humanity situated in space) and history (i.e., humanity situated in time).

Bacilli and toxins in human form remain unseen by generations of men. Historians ignore them, or more often feign to ignore them. Still, the existence of these agents is no mystery to the bacteriologists of society and history. It is they who cause fevers, decrepitude, decay, paralyses, convulsions, ageing, collapse, and death.

Their victims believe that the process affecting them is unfolding independently, by virtue of ineluctable laws intrinsic to the very nature of things – which is why they never react. After all, only a fool would react against the ineluctable nature of things...

The Commune of 1871 was no more spontaneous than the events of 1789, 1793, 1848, 1905, and 1917, or the disorders in China, India, Sudan, Syria, Turkey, Morocco, and Afghanistan. Even less spontaneous are all the strikes taking place in our age. It is nonetheless true that – as with animal organisms – in order for bacilli and toxins to accomplish their deadly work, the affected body must first have been weakened and damaged by exposure to weather and fatigue. Healthy organisms possessing all their strength usually manage to defend themselves and counteract baleful influences.

It is for this reason that social infections usually follow economic or political calamities, which is not to say that they are caused by them. No direct causal link exists between the military disasters of 1870 and the Commune.

One could understand the rabble wanting to lynch some of those responsible for the defeat. This too could only have occurred through pervasive insinuations on the part of those who had an interest in doing so. But the Commune of 1871 was no more anti-Bonapartist than it was anti-Orléanist or even anti-Gambettist. It was directed against all that was seen to embody the social order, whether good or bad. It was practically against everything.

One may retort that the people had been told that the social order itself was responsible for all ills. But this is precisely what we are arguing. A similar idea did not emerge spontaneously: it required a long preparation and sophisticated planning of the most detailed and careful sort.

Only a superficial observer without the slightest clue about the way in which revolutions are fashioned could believe that these were improvised symptoms. Men have always been men, and the masses have always been masses: the maturity they had allegedly reached

after just a few decades was but a huge bluff. There have always been defeats and setbacks, but only from the latter half of the nineteenth century have these invariably been followed by phenomena such as the Commune, which have gone to the exclusive profit of the Jews and the subversive elements of society.

There can be no doubt as to the fact that the First International, which was created and headed by Marx, the founder of modern socialism, acted as the driving force behind the Paris Commune. It made use of the Blanquist party³ like a lever: the party's leader was dead, but its traditions lived on, and did not need to be revived in the suburbs of the French capital.

The same process is at work nowadays in England, where the Third International is operating through the radical factions of the British trade unions, which it is gradually bolshevising.

The white-maned lion – as Marx is called by some of his disciples – could not make it to Paris himself, but still closely observed all that was taking place in the city. It was easy for him to do so, as he was regularly corresponding with all the major Communards, and especially Kügelmann,⁴ who appears to have acted as his spokesman in Paris.

The First International had already been around for a few years. It had already held several congresses, chiefly in Switzerland, under the presidency of the Judeo-socialist messiah in person. These congresses were the Council of Nicea of socialism, which by then had acquired unity and left its catacombs under the guidance of its master. Its gospel and creed were to be found in the *Communist Manifesto*, published in 1847. This booklet, which was made accessible by the working masses and signed by Marx and Engels, ended with the famous rallying cry: 'Workers of the world, unite!'

If we were to go by its appearance, this booklet was making a break with what had been regarded as the revolutionary essence until then, namely the monopoly of radical ideas which – according to the nineteenth-century way of thinking – was held by the French Revolution. These ideas had crystallised in the twin form of liberal democracy, connected to the Feuillants and moderate Girondinists, and radical democracy, connected to the radical Girondists and Jacobins.

The ideas issued from the French Revolution proclaimed individual equality and the non-existence of classes. In practice, both things were automatically denied.

Less hypocritically, the *Communist Manifesto* rejected all this sanctimonious liberalism, which was ultimately nothing but a convention adopted to mislead fools. The *Manifesto* instead openly proclaimed something that was already in people's minds but which no one had dared state until then. It proclaimed inequality and the dictatorship of one class above the rest. There was no need for this new ruling class to make up the majority, for this was not the case with the proletariat in regions comprised of small rural estates. It was enough for this class to be the poorest and less enlightened one – something the text does not openly state, of course. In other words, this new class coincided with the one which could most easily be indoctrinated and led wherever one pleased; and this, clearly, not only because its weak intelligence made it more prone to suggestion, but because it had

everything to gain and nothing to lose.

Only an apparently unbridgeable gap separates the *Communist Manifesto* from the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen*.⁵ If any gap is to be found at all, in fact, it is only in countries where the working class is still in the minority. This class, however, is becoming the most numerous everywhere, including in rural regions, where capitalism – another ally of the Jew – is striving to turn all estates, both large or small, into nothing but pieces of paper. People who were formerly small landholders are becoming city workers, whose work will be idly exploited by the former large landholders through the intermediation of Judaised banks and stock exchanges. Meanwhile, democracy is accelerating this process through its inheritance taxes and parcelling of the land, which is being divided into plots so small as to be of no practical economic value.

The *Communist Manifesto*, therefore, has simply accelerated a process which the leaders of subversion felt was unfolding too slowly.

This process began the day individual egalitarianism was proclaimed: it dates back to the French Revolution. Apparently, and to superficial observers – which is to say, to most men – Marx was burning what he professed to adore, namely the ‘immortal principle’ of equality among men and classes. This equality indirectly yet unequivocally serves as the basis for majority rule, on which all democratic legality rests. For this reason, modern democracy – the heir to the first revolution – is accusing the prince of the second revolution of wishing to re-establish the reign of privilege: an upside-down *ancien régime*.

There is another point on which people like to argue, namely that a chasm exists between the second revolutionary programme, which was espoused by Marx in his *Communist Manifesto*, and the first programme, that of the ‘immortal principles’ of the French Revolution, which still made the men of 1848 swoon. This arose because of the principle of nationalism, which the French Revolution and the revolutions of 1848 appear to have upheld, whereas the *Manifesto* treats it as a thing of the past.

Actually, the French Revolution only used the nationalist sentiment as a way of repelling foreign invasion, just as a man under attack might have grasped the first stick he found to defend himself against an aggressor – but he might have picked up a stone instead, if this had served him just as well. The Revolution later found that it could employ French nationalism as a valuable tool for its aggressive proselytism, and so continued to make use of it. Still, the so-called French Revolution initially aimed to become an international one.

To pursue this aim, it organised genuine congresses in Paris attracting subversive elements from all countries, just as the Russian Revolution is doing today. The latter, no doubt, will not hesitate to brandish the nationalist standard the day the Western powers will finally decide to attack it, especially if they were to invade Russia. After all, is it not the case that the current Chinese revolution – which we know was spawned by the Russian one – is already raising this standard to acquire legitimacy in the eyes of the stupid Europeans?

Nationalism offered too great an opportunity for the revolutionary movements of 1848. We have already frequently referred to the huge service which nationalism⁶ paid to the

cause of subversion by dividing the Christian front, thereby preventing it from standing united against the common enemy. The groups that followed the path of the French Revolution would have been ill-inspired and indeed ungrateful if they had sought to reject this ally – an ally that is made all the more precious by the fact that it is unaware of being such, and which in practice may prove the most important ally of all.

Let us open our window and stare at what is going on in the street: what we shall see is the world Revolution, very strategically split into two armies, each pursuing a different goal. The first openly draws upon the French Revolution and that of 1848, brazenly claiming to be a barrier against the other army. Its mission is to spread among the Christian nations so as to rouse their nationalistic antagonisms to a frenzy. At the same time, in the name of democracy, it seeks to exacerbate old forms of animosity among different groups and individuals within single countries. These feelings have not yet been exhausted by the French Revolution, whose work of equalisation and levelling awaits completion.

The mission of the second army of subversion – the one rallying under the banner of the *Communist Manifesto* – is to join all the militant forces of subversion into a single, homogeneous, and compact bloc centred around a Jewish core. These forces will provide the assault battalions for shattering the opposite front, which will have been split horizontally by nationalism and vertically by democracy in all of its various forms.

All these things hang together and are part of one and the same conspiracy, whose authors see nationalism as Gambetta⁷ saw clericalism: as something worth exporting if Jews can benefit from it. This is everywhere the case: in Europe, as well as in other parts of the world.

Nationalism is thus being exported along with the Rights of Man and worthless Communist trash, which is why it has become popular again today.⁸

In a way, the Paris Commune signalled the entrance of the second of these revolutionary waves onto the historical stage. It was later destined to manifest itself more acutely with Bolshevism and proletarian terrorism. Until the Commune, however, it hadn't yet left the world of intellectual speculation. It was only in 1871 that this new avatar of the spirit of revolt came to life. Its adherents, far from bowing before the 'immortal principles' as all previous rebels had done, regarded them as retrograde and outdated ideas.

There was no divide separating the two revolutionary currents which had sprung from the same Jewish source; rather, the two fitted together. The Commune was their point of intersection. In a way, it stemmed from both currents, representing a sort of intermediate species between the two. It was this lack of a unified character that ultimately caused the final defeat of the Commune and prevented the rise of Bolshevism in a corner of Europe fifty years before the fated date.

It is particularly interesting to study the Paris Commune because it shows the two revolutionary currents – that of '89 and that of the *Manifesto* – facing and hampering each other, to the point of thwarting the enterprise of those who had made the mistake of seeking to reconcile them.

Two human types are to be found among the leaders of the Commune. On the one hand, we have proletarians directly inspired by the First International: the spiritual forefathers of contemporary Bolsheviks (for it was the First International which spawned the Third). These people contemptuously turned their backs on the 'glorious day' of the French Revolution, which they already regarded as an outdated model; all they had in mind was the 'great evening' to come.

Then we have the petty bourgeois and shopkeepers of the capital, who harboured ideas like those of Monsieur Homais⁹ and were rather similar to the radicals or radical socialists of today. These people were republicans driven primarily by anti-clericalism; often they were also quite nationalist and sported the revolutionary cockade of the 'immortal principles'. They only half agreed with the revolutionary tradition of '89 and '48 and still had scruples based on the idea of democratic legality, which is to say the principle whereby sovereignty rests with the majority. They appear not to have realised that they had already departed from this principle, insofar as the Commune was not a French but only a Parisian affair: from the point of view of democratic legality, as conceived by its leading theoreticians, a city – be it even a capital or the City of Light itself – has no right to determine the fate of an entire nation. This is particularly the case when it has received no mandate from the latter and is acting behind its back – for at a certain point all communication between Paris and the rest of France was cut off.

Driven by a force beyond their control, the Communards could not act lawfully towards France from the point of view of an alleged legality based on the number of votes. One is led to wonder, therefore, why so many of them were so keen not to transgress this holy principle of democracy with regard to the city of Paris.

Concern for the 'immortal principles' was such that at a given moment, the Communards missed the chance to crush Thiers' government,¹⁰ installed at the gates of Paris, at Versailles, because elections first had to be held to ask for democracy's permission.

This way of acting was indeed worthy of faint-hearted merchants accustomed to their routine. Marx and Lenin remarked that the Communards had been like revolutionary stones petrified by the principles of the French Revolution – just as others had been petrified by the prejudices of the *ancien régime*.

The French Revolution was the Communards' *ancien régime*. Saturated by its spirit down to their very marrow, they completely lacked flexibility and boldness. The immortal principles of 1789 and 1848 held them back through curious feelings of human respect, timorousness, and scruple.

True revolutionaries do not act in this manner. They do not wait for power to be bestowed on them: they simply take it. They care nothing about the alleged popular will, which they treat just as their fathers treated divine right – the holy principle of their day. This is how the Bolsheviks acted, having learned from the experience of the Commune, from which they openly admit to having benefited.

It would be difficult to single out any leader of the Commune. In fact, there were none. From start to finish, there was only a Central Committee – a sort of 'Soviet of the National

Guard' – which squabbled with the Commune, instead of leading it by the nose. This is what the Bolsheviks did half a century later with all those who resisted them, on the Left as well as on the Right.

Under these conditions, a revolution – and particularly one with such radical ideas – could never be expected to triumph. Marx realized this, much to his distress. His advice went unheeded and his agents were overwhelmed by the Tower of Babel of the democrats from the new '*ancien régime*'.

From another point of view, however, the Paris Commune was indeed 'all the rage' in its day. After all, it embodied the first historical attempt to establish a government of the workers, for the workers. But while workers made up the majority, they had not yet been sufficiently moulded by the First International. The Commune coincided with a phase of transition between the fierce, romantic ideology of 1848 and the merciless, utilitarian, and materialist cynicism that was destined to gain the upper hand in the future. Jewish influence was strong, yet perhaps caught off-guard by the speed at which events unfolded. Consequently, Jewry failed to take control of the situation, as it later did at Petrograd in 1917.

The dictatorship of the proletariat had been established, but there were no Jewish dictators to exercise it. This may explain the weakness and ultimate failure of the Commune, despite the atrocities it unsystematically committed.

A revolution, however radical it may be, is destined to be scattered if there are no Jews to direct it by channelling its various movements toward their anti-Christian imperialism.

Christians – even if they are only former Christians like the Communards – will commit unnecessary crimes, while failing to commit others which would be required. The Commune may have executed an archbishop and a few generals, and knocked down the Vendôme Column, but it had scruples which a Jewish government would simply have ignored. It committed murders for which it then apologised with lofty statements about the grand aims of the Conventions, instead of shunning public opinion and forging ahead. For this is how the Jew, a born revolutionary, would have acted.

The Commune nonetheless may be seen to have adopted certain methods which later made the fortune of Bolshevism. It would take hostages and thus terrorise its enemies, who trembled and feared for their close ones.

It is this method of taking hostages and leading hundreds of them to painful deaths in retaliation for every attack against a high-ranking Bolshevik that enabled the great leaders of the Russian Revolution to preserve their own lives.

French readers, who might have heard stories about the 1871 Commune from their parents and relatives, will be surprised to learn that one of the most serious reproaches brought against the Communards by leaders of the Russian Revolution such as Lenin and Trotsky is the charge of having been too soft with those under them and with their enemies. This in itself gives a good enough idea of how terrible the year 1917 and the ten years¹¹ thereafter must have been in Russia.

The Commune is only one generation away from us. There is therefore no need to discuss the alleged softness of its methods, as its history is known well enough and almost still living in people's memory.

One of the distinguishing features of the Commune was its sectarian character, which it demonstrated in its approach to Christianity. Its spiritual roots unequivocally bear the mark of Jewry: it is easy to see how the unreasonable and especially deep hatred harboured against Catholic priests was not a natural feeling inherent to the soul of the proletariat in an age in which the Church had long ceased being a source of domination or persecution, and in which individuals were quite free to ignore it.

The Second Empire is so close to us that there is no need to explain that it was not an age of religious intolerance or great ecclesiastical influences, capable of weighing peoples down in any way. On the contrary, it was an age of largely unprecedented indifference toward religious matters. There were few practising Catholics and even they could hardly have put any pressure on their fellow citizens, even if they had wished to do so. Fortune's favour was to be sought in the growing number of temples of Mammon, not in any Catholic church.

How could people envy the wealth of the clergy, when there was nothing to even suggest its existence?

It was the bankers who had all the nice carriages, luxury hotels, stables filled with race horses, and bejewelled babes the sight of which might have roused bad – albeit all too human – feelings of greed, envy, and spite in the hearts of the working classes. But nothing, absolutely nothing, in the figure of clergymen – who were often the sons of workers themselves – could have reasonably engendered such feelings.

Should we demolish all mosques and kill all mullahs for the simple reason that we do not believe in Muhammad? Such thoughts have never sprung to the mind of even the most malicious, vicious, and depraved among us – why should they?

Are the Communards' feelings of hatred, then, to be interpreted as forms of sadism, sexual perversion, or mental depravity connected to known pathological conditions? Well, no.

The striking thing is that certain events came to pass in a century of almost complete religious indifference. People were entirely captivated by the idea of mechanisation and were hardly concerned with theological, liturgical, and dogmatic issues.

This is a subject which our contemporaries would do well to explore. Let them simply consider for a moment what the possible origin may have been of this intense hatred which Parisian workers felt in 1871 for priests, who were neither their bosses nor their superiors.

Priests had few ties with them. By choosing to be an unbeliever, a worker could relegate priests to the margins of his life, preventing them from influencing his future in any way. Nor was there anything particularly enviable in priests' spirit or lifestyle, which were certainly less enviable than those of the middle classes. Workers, especially ones who

were unbelievers, ought to have seen priests simply as passers-by they might have come across in the street now and then – men with no rights over their lives and no hold over their fates.

From what mysterious depth, then, might this hatred have surged? The answer is already contained in the question itself. This mysterious depth was most certainly not to be found in the souls of shopkeepers or workers. Rather, it was a mental suggestion induced from the outside. Its roots lay in the radical and socialist intellectual milieu, and in Masonic lodges.

Yet this answer does not solve the problem, which remains open, but only eschews the question.

When examining these subjects, it is easy to overlook an important psychological fact: in order to hate a given faith, it is not enough merely not to adhere to it; rather, one must have an opposite faith, which is the negation of the former.

It is also easy to overlook another psychological fact, one that is perhaps even more important for the purposes of the present discussion: to hate a religious faith, it is necessary to hold a different religious one. Possession of a faith that is political, social, patriotic, or of any other sort could only indirectly explain this kind of hatred in age of religious intolerance – an age in which religion is so closely intertwined with politics and social or international affairs that it actually influences them.

If there is any century which might be criticised in all respects except from this point of view, it is certainly the nineteenth, particularly in its latter half. The reason for the profound and Satanic feelings of horror inspired by Christianity, and especially the Roman Catholic Church, is not to be found in the political, economic, or social faith held by Freemasons, radicals, and socialists, but rather in their anti-Christian religious faith exclusively.

This relentless loathing spread to the working classes and petty bourgeoisie through a thousand underground channels that were skilfully arranged for this purpose. This religious faith held by the subversive milieu in command of the situation was not – as many of our contemporaries naively imagine – merely accessory to politics and economics. It was and still is the essential feature of world subversion: it is politics, economics, and ethics – depending on expediency – that are accessory to it.

This apocalyptic¹² evil *par excellence* continues to foster the revolt of the angel who no longer wished to serve among men. It prolongs the sin of Eden, for men have been made to believe that through disobedience they will become God-like and will be able to govern themselves without taking account of authority.

A striking example of this is provided by contemporary Russia. In the economic field, we are witnessing an extension and exacerbation of the worst forms of capitalistic serfdom and medieval abuse: the common people in this country have fallen into misery while the rich have been ruined completely, all for the profit of the Jews and their close servants. In the political sphere we have an upside-down aristocratic oligarchy, Jewish by three-

quarters, which rules the people with an iron fist. This religious faith and everything connected to it stands at the very opposite of the Christian ideal, as an antithesis might stand to a thesis.

The pro-socialist elements across the world are in favour of the state of affairs we have just described, which they actually ought to resolutely condemn if they were to follow the purely profane principles they claim to embrace. All those professing to be radicals, or simply liberals, find it difficult to conceal their discreet, yet profound, sympathy for this historical outrage. Finally, capitalists in both hemispheres are secretly allied with Bolshevism, for without capitalist support, the latter would be long dead – or, rather, would never have arisen in the first place – given its anti-capitalist tirades, which are intended to be exported and spread among the poor (who are being misled by their own misery). It was through the work and arms of the poor – if not their brains – that the Paris Commune of 1871 was set up.

It is easy to see that this link is no profane or secular faith.

It is something less evident, yet infinitely more enduring and profound.

This mysterious link is a religious faith, one as deeply rooted in the souls of its followers as early Christianity was. This faith has its profiteers, but also – and one must acknowledge it – a fair number of selfless apostles who have undergone persecution and shed their blood for it.

We are here faced, then, with a metapsychical¹³ mystery that is quite unfathomable even to the developed mind of ordinary man. For how can certain individuals choose to give their lives out of a selfless love for evil with no hope for their immortal souls and no material concern for their children or loved ones, whom in many cases they will cold-bloodedly sacrifice, feeling they are accomplishing some sinister duty in doing it?

These are undeniable facts which are unequivocally proven by the history of all countries in all ages, including our own. If we were to seek an explanation for it, we would not find it through human logic alone, as there is only one science which can provide it. And this science – our agnostic readers will forgive us – is Christian theology.

Within it we find two types of superhuman and absolute selflessness: that of the being who, while omnipotent, cannot increase his own exaltation, namely God; and that of the being who cannot further aggravate his degradation, namely Satan. The supreme good and the supreme evil thus represent the two perfect types of selflessness.

As everything in the world originates from either one or the other of these principles, the selflessness of certain men with respect to evil is as understandable as the selflessness of others with respect to good. To pursue evil merely for profit, self-interest, and the satisfaction of the flesh is only a weakness of the flesh. With a few exceptions, we all fall into this category. But while this applies to the masses, it does not apply to their genuine spiritual leaders, who do not guide the sweeping historical offensive of evil for profit, weakness of the flesh, or self-interest. Rather, they do so out of love: specifically for that negative love which is the hatred of all that stems from God.

A Satanic current parallel to the Christian one flows through history. It does so just as selflessly, waging its perpetual battle against Christianity.

This mysterious and deep hatred is essentially different and superior to the various other forms of hatred we find in history. The latter are often fierce and shameful, but always driven by strictly human motives such as envy, pride, rancour, and vengeance. They never possess the sort of permanent character that leads one to constantly focus on the same object for no apparent reason – for Christ himself stated: ‘They hate me for no reason.’ Precisely because they concern specific things – tangible causes commensurate to given effects – normal forms of hatred do not possess the frightening character of a stream of primitive fury that inevitably brings demonic possession to mind. As Christ put it: ‘This is your time – the time when darkness rules.’

Hatred of this sort lies beyond all reason and is quite imponderable. It corresponds to a mysterious crisis affecting not the body, but the soul.

* * *

After the Commune, the revolutionary flame made its way back underground, where it lay dormant for forty years, with only sudden and violent blazes here and there.

In 1789, the fire had ravaged France.

In 1848, it had extended to Europe.

In 1914, the whole world was set ablaze by the Great War – the prelude to social upheavals of which Bolshevism is but the first concrete manifestation.

[1](#) Evola entitles this chapter, ‘The Commune: The Metaphysics of Revolutionary Hatred’.—Ed.

[2](#) The revolutionary government proclaimed a new calendar in 1793, although it had fallen out of use by 1805.—Ed.

[3](#) The Blanquists, who adhered to the principles of Louis Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881), held that socialism should be introduced by a small, secretive elite seizing power at the top of a society, rather than relying on the masses to instigate a revolution, as Marx held.—Ed.

[4](#) Louis Kügelmann (1828-1902) was a German gynecologist and a Social Democrat who was a friend of both Marx and Engels.—Ed.

[5](#) The *Declaration*, passed by the French Assembly in 1789, was the fundamental statement of the principles of the French Revolution.—Ed.

[6](#) Evola has, ‘democratic nationalism’.—Ed.

[7](#) Léon Gambetta (1838-1882) was an assemblyman who came to prominence following the suppression of the Commune. He assisted in the creation of the new Constitution in 1875, pursuing a course of moderation between radicals and conservatives which he termed ‘opportunism’.—Ed.

[8](#) For this paragraph, Evola substitutes, ‘Only very recently was nationalism to shed its democratic overtones and follow a different course, in some cases resolutely converging against those dark forces which had so often exploited it in the previous phase. Elsewhere, however, and especially among coloured races, Moscow continues to play by the old rules: it uses nationalist ideology as a way of making these peoples rise up against the hegemony of the European powers and join the international red front.’—Ed.

[9](#) Monsieur Homais is a character in Flaubert's novel *Madame Bovary*, a shopkeeper who adheres to the ideas of Voltaire and other republican and scientific ideas.—Ed.

[10](#) Adolphe Thiers (1797-1877) was a politician and historian, and a former Prime Minister, who became head of the provisional government following the collapse of the Second Empire in 1871, and he ultimately crushed the Commune.—Ed.

[11](#) Evola just has, 'following ones'.—Ed.

[12](#) Evola has 'metaphysical' instead.—Ed.

[13](#) Metapsychology refers to aspects of psychology which cannot necessarily be understood through empirical science.—Ed.

1914-1918: The Great War¹

When the order of general mobilisation was sounded from the Pyrenees to the borders of China, the impression among all peoples was one of astonishment more than consternation. It was difficult for them to realise just what was happening.

For most men, war meant one or more big battles with breaks of a few days or weeks in between. Then, except in certain areas whose borders might have been shifted a few dozen – or, more rarely, a few hundred – kilometres backwards or forward, things would soon have got back to normal.

Given the power of modern weapons, which had been rendered particularly deadly through applied physics and chemistry, people certainly feared that the number of people killed or wounded would be much higher than ever before.

A war of this sort, based on universal conscription, could never be a *lance war*,² such as those waged in ages in which the elites alone had the right to bear arms. As much as this claim will upset the partisans of democracy, it is indeed the case that brutality is most common among the lower strata of the human race. Modern warfare has simply confirmed what plebeian revolts and revolutions – in which such elements were at work – had already long since proven.

One of the great merits of Christianity consists precisely in having turned the profession of arms into a ‘noble art’ reserved for the best and regarded as a privilege – an art entailing specific duties known as the code of honour.

By contrast, modern war, which is a conflict among nations and not simply among armies, seeks to destroy the economic output of the enemy along with his military power. It therefore treats devastation as a strategic duty. This in itself makes modern warfare and its methods necessarily immoral, as becomes most painfully evident when war is waged in enemy territory.

What people were hoping, however, was that the evil aspects of modern warfare might ultimately turn out to be a good thing by shortening the conflict.

People generally believed that the war which had broken out in August would last two or three months, ending in early winter at the very latest.

We ourselves were the first to think along these lines.

We believed that Russia would soon be put out of action, whereas things would be more uncertain in the West – although Germany seemed to hold some advantage. To avoid losing countless lives to preserve the integrity of Russia, Western powers would have then negotiated with Germany. The latter had few reasons to make any claims in the west, and a hundred times as much to gain from the east.

In such a way, a peace advantageous for both sides would have been signed, without any real winners or losers except Russia. The country would have been partitioned – at least to

some extent – into areas of influence assigned to each of the warring parties. The sovereignty of the Tsar would have been safeguarded, just as that of the Sultan in Bosnia, Crete, and Macedonia.

A similar outcome would have meant putting an end to the congestion of civilised peoples for quite some time, which was the only natural cause of the War in reality – if not the only cause at work, as we naively believed at the time.

Leaving aside what was taking place behind the curtains and what only initiates could know, the first stages in the Great War appeared to fully confirm the above predictions.

Only a few weeks later, most of the German army was stopped in its impetuous drive toward Paris and forced to take up a fixed position during the memorable days of the Marne. It was not defeated, though, and still less quashed.

At the same time, most of the Russian army, including its best troops, were literally crushed by a small contingent of German forces in the great Battle of Tannenberg.

This moment signalled the end of the War, in the sense that its final outcome could already be foretold. The outcome of the War simply lay in the Battle of the Marne to the west and Tannenberg to the east. These two battles carried the four years of useless butchery that followed in themselves, just as seeds may be said to contain potential trees.

Those who had imagined that the War would last no more than two or three months had not really been mistaken after all, as in any other century or age the conflict would indeed have ended with these two battles. The first battle froze the Germans where they ought not to have gone in the first place – where it made no sense for them to go, for it meant simply increasing everyone's congestion, starting with their own.

This first battle contained a clear warning for the Germans, a warning written in blood: that they were to follow a different path and were not bound to pass through Paris.

The second battle instead opened up the gates of Russian Asia to the Germans: the place where they ought to have gone. A German advance into this vast territory would have meant the beginning of the de-congestion of civilised peoples, since there was plenty of land there, not only for the Germans but for all those wise enough to follow their example. People in this endless expanse would never have bothered one another and would have found no reason to plot their mutual destruction.

Those who had imagined that the War would last no more than two months were ultimately proven wrong. In all good faith, they had believed that the War served a purpose which actually meant something to the parties involved. In doing so, they had ignored a powerful player whose aspirations and interests lay beyond what was good and profitable for each of the warring parties – which is to say, everyone else.

If Europe had been comprised of absolute monarchies and governments and had not been forced to take account of occult contingencies and influences that went against the actual interests of its peoples; if faceless capitalism hadn't been in control of all drives behind personal and collective life, making things take a direction opposite to the one they ought

to have taken – then the War would certainly have lasted no more than two or three months. The solution adopted to bring the conflict to a prompt end, to everyone's advantage, would probably have been similar to that which we have just outlined.

The prompt and advantageous settlement of a frightening cataclysm that threatened to extend even further – turning from a European conflict into a global one – was a compelling option for all reasonable and honest men. What we call logic, evidence, and truth are things of great intrinsic power that risked spilling out of oppressed hearts and minds like an avalanche.

This prospect posed a huge danger:³ something had to be done before it was too late. Judaised propaganda, which fashions public opinion by influencing the multitudes, put everything to work toward this supreme battle.

Thus another war was waged, parallel to the tangible one and without which the latter would have lasted a shorter period in months than it lasted in years. This campaign of subversion was concealed under national garbs and passed off as something respectable.

The people's way of thinking was the battlefield in which it wreaked such frightful havoc – albeit in a less evident way than the war waged in the other sphere.

The history of this war has yet to be written. On the day on which it will be, humanity will be shocked. This will not be the humanity of today, however, in which traces of the bewitchment which was worked still survive. What we are talking about are future generations.

If judged from the point of view of the logical requirements of international politics, as taught by past history, the events which followed 1914 will appear as a muddle of contradictions.

These events become understandable, and indeed quite clear, by contrast in the light of the fact that the Great War was merely a front for the advancing revolution.

Everyone knows that the War was an unprecedented tragedy. Detailed statistics give us the number of people killed and mutilated, of the cities destroyed, fields devastated, and historical monuments irreparably damaged.

Many authors from all the warring nations have discussed this subject. We shall not waste our time repeating what is universally known.

We must instead focus on a different kind of damage: one hardly ever discussed, yet incomparably more serious for its historical consequences than all the wounds inflicted, which time and forgetfulness are bound to heal.

First of all, in all countries and regimes, the World War has favoured the rise of subversive ideals based on Jewish values. These ideals had merely begun to take shape with the most serious revolutions of the past. With the War they were instead realised in practice, and came to affect men's lives and mores. They were often imposed against people's will and despite all resistance, for the simple reason that without them, the War would not have continued.

Rousseau is the author of a famous postulate that inspired two centuries of subversion and is itself rooted in the Jewish notion of polity: 'Liberty consists in the total alienation of each associate, together with all his rights, to the whole community.' This is the idolatrous ideal of men who have forgotten they were created by God and for God, their Creator, believing they merely exist thanks to and for the polity.⁴

The World War brought these principles out of sociological workshops and directly applied them to the everyday life of all men.

In practice, private property ceased to exist: it was only tolerated to the extent that its owners were seen as tax-paying servants of the state and collaborated to attain the triumph of ideas of which they may have personally disapproved.

After people had been forced to send their children to get killed in order to 'make democracy comfortable' – without having ever been asked whether they themselves felt comfortable – their horses, cattle, carts, and household goods were seized. They were ordered to plant potatoes in their fields and rationing was imposed upon them, even if they were producers themselves. Sometimes people's houses were seized, leaving them just enough space to live in. All this was politely referred to as 'requisitioning'.

Private accounts were examined, as was the way owners managed their property. Industrialists had their factories militarised and workers were mobilised by the state. Individuals, with everything they had or embodied, came to be regarded as the property of the state: like things, war materiel, and robots whose only feelings, thoughts, and desires were to be those of their leaders.

People were expected to jump in with all guns blazing for the war and to treat it as if it were a personal quarrel. Depending on their country of birth, they were to consider the Germans, English, or French as their personal enemies.

If someone close to them was murdered or crippled, they were expected not to complain but to consider themselves lucky if the papers said they had died for democracy.

Those men whose fathers had been dispossessed, humiliated, shot, or guillotined by democracy were expected to welcome the idea of offering up their own possessions and lives upon the altar of democracy. These were men who were about to be openly treated as second-class citizens, and who because of their interests, temperaments, and inborn sentiments could only endure the yoke of democracy with profound horror.⁵

If we examine the meaning of the aforementioned postulate by Rousseau, we shall soon realise that it contains the seeds not only of all democracy, but also of all forms of socialism and Communism, as the latter are simply the logical outcome of the former.

This unlikely and disconcerting utopia became incorporated into real life through the exceptional requirements imposed by a war with no historical precedents.

Slowly and gradually, what had been a mere emergency measure came to permeate what is second nature to men as social creatures: their customs and habits.

After all, socialisation was never officially or juridically imposed, in the sense that the

big owners, be they landowners or industrialists, continued to be known as such. They continued to be paid the same respect as before and to play an important role, yet this was only with national production in mind: strictly speaking, they exercised the function of public functionaries under state control. They were not owners in the genuine and literal sense of the term, for they could no longer claim to be masters – after God – over their ancestral possessions, on the sole condition of respecting laws which no normal and civilised being would seek to transgress.

Nobody seemed to realise that this situation *de facto* represented the accomplishment of the socialist plan. For the only truly essential condition for this plan – all else being but accessory demagoguery – is state control over all production, or rather all sources of value, which the state will then distribute.

This is the state capitalism Lenin has described and defined in many of his works as the penultimate stage: the anteroom to his paradise.

The transition from this state of affairs – which the most famous Bolshevik writers, starting from Marx and Lenin, regard as a preliminary and necessary stage – to that which is openly advocated by the apostle of the new order does not require any social revolution: a simple palace revolution, or rather cabinet revolution, is enough.

Without any great upheavals, the capitalism of the bourgeois state will then be replaced by what Lenin calls the capitalism of the proletarian state – that which Soviet Russia acknowledges to be its current regime. After all, we are here quoting Lenin almost to the letter.

As for the placid masses, which subversives scorn far more than the old aristocracies ever did, their role is now simply to shout ‘The King is dead, long live the King!’, while embarking on a pilgrimage to visit the tomb of this or that Lenin – just as they would have done with saints’ tombs only a few years ago.

For the uninitiated, the new monarch will be the people: farmers and workers expressing their will through councils directly appointed by them (*soviety* in Russian, Soviets in English).

For the half-initiated – such as Lenin himself, to judge from his confessions – the new monarch will be the Communist Party: the chosen guardian of the poor until the day in which they will have come of age.

But for the initiated – and Lenin’s confessions do not extend that far – the monarch is simply Jewish Mammonism, concealed under the label of ‘Communist Party’.

The above argument, except for the last point, is simply based on the teachings of the greatest Bolsheviks.

By adopting socialism, which had previously been regarded as an unworkable chimera, the princes and landed gentry who controlled Germany and Austria practically up until the armistice paved the way for subversion – the landmark event in the aftermath of the War – even more so than the democratic and Judaised leaders of republican France, liberal

Britain, and pro-Masonic Italy. If they went further in this direction than their adversaries, this was not intentional, but simply because the geographic configuration of their countries, in the face of the blockade imposed upon them, required a greater concentration of all sources of value and means of production in the hands of the state. This called for tighter control over private property as well as people, which is to say for a form of social constraint reminiscent of the socialist ideal – the dreadful constraint which Rousseau regarded as the ultimate expression of freedom.

The leaders of the two great reactionary monarchies, who for the most part were members of the landed gentry themselves, were not simply madmen unaware of what they were doing. While they may have overestimated the traditional virtues of their people and their immunity against the virus of subversion – although the future has proven that they had not been completely mistaken in this respect – they were quite conscious of the deadly risks they were running. Still, they could hardly have acted otherwise, for they found themselves caught between the devil and the deep blue sea.

The devil was the frightening spectre of the possibility that the outlook of the working classes might gradually take a subversive direction, opening up a range of revolutionary scenarios. The deep blue sea was the fear of an immediate revolution sparked by the inevitable trigger of all social unrest: hunger.

The only way to avert this scenario – or at any rate to contain its consequences – was to drive production to its limits, or even beyond them through new inventions and applications.

The old leaders thus chose the less immediate and imminent of these two scenarios. They found themselves in the tragic situation of someone rolling down a slope toward a chasm, knowing full well they will fall into it but unable to stop, and with no other hope but the chance of being saved by some fortunate event at the last moment. This event could only have been a decisive victory, but on the western front a similar prospect had become rather unlikely after the Battle of the Marne.

Those who argue that the great conflagration was caused by a clash of economic interests are not far off the mark. Still, they are quite mistaken if they believe that this clash was fatal in itself.

The cause of the War was the desire to change the inner structure of society in general and to help world subversion take a great leap forward.

This momentous intention is where all threads of modern history converge. We should never lose sight of it, if we are to avoid losing ourselves in the inextricable tangle of events.

The War was a new offensive of the Revolution. It had been planned through decades of convoluted diplomacy in the intentional pursuit of the very opposite of what common sense dictated.⁶

The Revolution was not at all concerned about giving Alsace and Lorraine to France, or Trentino to Italy, or with pleasing Britain by assigning it a few more Negroes. The

changing of borders in no way aided its cause. The Revolution left these trifles to the blind patriots who had gone through such pains to prepare its triumphal banquet. The chief concern of the Revolution, after four years of unprecedented slaughter, was to bring down the last bastions threatening democratic progress, as President Wilson later stated.

Besides, as soon as it was no longer necessary to take account of the feelings of the Tsar, an unwilling victim to his own inconceivable folly, things such as these were quite openly declared. This outburst followed quite naturally, as certain people became free to express the secret that filled their hearts, and which they had been forced to conceal for so long with the greatest effort.

After the imperial guest was told to 'go get hanged elsewhere'⁷ – which might not be literally what happened, but is not far from the truth – he was replaced by an American fellow who was aware of the real meaning of events. Things were thus kept within the family. Why continue to hold back the stream of democratic outpourings that had hardly been contained until then?

The time had come to unceremoniously give oneself over to sheer joy, without the slightest concern for the thousands of honest men who continued to suffer and die for democracy, a regime they despised and which was about to treat them – in all countries – as the only real losers of the War.⁸

Thanks to the thorough work which had been carried out by the social termites of democracy, only anonymous property and anonymous authority were acknowledged in the economic and political spheres. Likewise, heroism and merit were only recognised under the veil of democratic anonymity and impersonality. Tangible proof of this transformation in the people's way of thinking through the gradual yet unrelenting instillation of Jewish values was soon to be found in the monuments erected to the 'Unknown Soldier'. This figure came to be praised not only more than the great leaders who had brought victory, but also and above all by the more modest heroes who had sprung from the people.

Based on sheer statistical probability, it is most likely that this 'Unknown Soldier' – whether French, British, Italian, or Polish – was a man of the people. It is equally probable that this fact will be implicitly known and that this new cult will come to be seen as a popular one by the masses. The 'Unknown Soldier' will therefore ingeniously be turned into a sort of anonymous champion whose impersonal and popular character will somehow counterbalance the personal prestige enjoyed by 'known' leaders and heroes. The latter are guilty of embodying a striking example of inequality, and hence of officially disproving the democratic theory according to which each person is simply an expression of the collective.⁹

It must be acknowledged that democracy gave proof of possessing the laudable virtue of frankness in the last eighteen months of the War, for it no longer concealed the fact that it was simply pursuing its goals through the onslaught.

The aims of the World War were quite clear in the minds of the anonymous milieus who wished to turn it into a 'total' conflict, namely: the destruction of the feudal Hapsburg

empire and its replacement with a hive of radical and economically unviable republics bound to be at the mercy of the Jew, and the Jewish corrosion of the medieval Asian empire of the Tsars and its transformation into a great hotbed for the Jewish world revolution of the future.

To this we can add the creation of a fervently democratic Polish republic, bound to find itself – on account of the absurd arrangement of its borders – forever caught in a state of latent conflict with Germany. It was feared that the latter might experience a counter-revolutionary awakening and expand to the east, an area which was by now sacred to the forces of subversion.¹⁰

Clearly, the democratic Republic of Poland was bound to soon play the tragic and disgraceful role of a western buffer for the Judeo-Satanic orgy of Moscow. Any attempt to spoil this plan was strictly prohibited, as the very centre of universal decomposition was to be established through it.

To all this we should add the democratic turn in people's way of thinking, the result of the inversion of all the traditional values of the human person. It was necessary to make Europe into a suitable broth of nutrients for the microbes which were spreading at the same time in Russia.

The capitalist or socialist turn in people's way of thinking – through the forced introduction of state control and collective forms of economy in those countries which had until then resisted them the most – was no secondary matter, since it contributed to the development of democracy and the preparing of that broth we have just mentioned.

We should also take account of the striking rise of indebtedness, which exclusively benefitted international Jewry, and its ubiquitous lending of money to up-and-coming democratic regimes, both great and small. Nations thus began indirectly financing the very cause of their misfortunes.

The ultimate aim of the War – the goal *par excellence*, the summation and crowning of all others – consisted of fostering physical, material, and moral exhaustion and lassitude among both winners and losers, confounding their ideas and values, in such a way that no state would ever intervene after the War against the spread of the infection whose centre was Moscow. Nothing was to prevent this deadly disease from travelling freely, far and wide across the entire world.

With this, we believe to have illustrated all the essential aspects of the plans developed by the aforementioned milieus. After having deliberately made war unavoidable, these milieus chose to wage it to the very end, until the fruits of subversion were ripe enough to be picked.

After three years of conflict and unspeakable suffering, this stage was finally reached.

The various cells of the front of subversion had done a good job at spreading their influence through speeches and writings among overexcited minds in all the most vulnerable areas. The clan of international subversion rejoiced at the long-awaited triumph that had been the real object of the War. Still, it was not too ostentatious in its rejoicing for

Russia, where there was still a chance that Tsarism might unexpectedly rise from its death bed, as certain attitudes of its last political representatives appeared to suggest. But as soon as this last scruple vanished, the truth which had been concealed for so long finally shone forth.

President Wilson became its herald. He gave almost immediate expression to a new state of mind which was far from having emerged spontaneously – for nothing ever does.

It was like a forest fire long smouldering in the soil, consuming all roots, and then suddenly lighting ablaze and enveloping the very summits of the trees – which were already partially dried up, yet still green.

From that moment onwards, the War could be said to have already accomplished most of the goals which constituted its actual *raison d'être* in the minds of those who had planned it.

By that stage, democracy had gained a sure foothold in Europe. To the west it was flanked by the even more developed American democracy. To the east it found the Judeo-Muscovite model of democracy, which was anxious to beat all records of 'progress'. In its wake stood all 'young' democratic states, which were expressions of democracy rather than nationalism: for one and the same process was at work behind the creation of Poland, Bohemia, Croatia, Lithuania, and all the various other countries which were destined to spring from a peace that completed the subversive work of the War.

Democracy could now speak openly, for it no longer needed to conceal itself. It no longer hesitated to fully reveal the hideous and shocking truth to the world: that if rivers of blood had been spilled and continued to be spilled (the year was 1917), this was not in vain, since the democratic front was already the potential master of the battlefield. After all, if the real aim of the War was democracy, had it not been met?

The so-called war among nations was simply a long-awaited and planned conflict based on a complicated series of secret manoeuvres and intrigues. It was a battle between Revolution and Counter-Revolution.

This is the only real meaning of the War.

Democracy had never found itself in such a good position. It had never been given the chance to perform so brilliantly before the attentive eyes of the five continents.

Still, when the time came to pass from theory to practice and show peoples that the idea of a republic is not only a fine thing under an empire, what happened was an unprecedented fiasco.

When put to the test, democracy proved its incapacity and frightening harmfulness.

¹ Evola entitles this chapter, '1914-1918: The Two Faces of the Great War'.—Ed.

² The Lace Wars refers to a series of wars which took place in Europe from the late seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth century between the various monarchies. One of the prizes was the town of Mecheline, on the border between Belgium and Holland, which produced a highly well-regarded type of lace.—Ed.

3 Evola adds, ‘for the occult front of world subversion’.—Ed.

4 For this sentence, Evola substitutes, ‘This, of course, would be a community that has been stripped of all sacredness and become purely materialistic: one that finds its *raison d’être* in itself and opposes its collectivism – as irrational as it is omnipotent – to all laws from on high, as well as all traditional forms of human dignity and freedom.’—Ed.

5 For the previous six paragraphs, including this one, Evola substitutes, ‘By yielding to these principles, human life necessarily acquired a “total” character; and this, in turn, necessarily became a general rule which continued to be in force even once the emergency state of war that had led to its advent had passed.’—Ed.

6 We would like here to recommend de Poncins’ book, *Société des Nations, Super État Maçonnique* (Paris, 1936), which gives readers an account of a congress held by international Freemasonry in Paris in the summer of 1917. In this congress the true intention behind the World War – which was then in full swing – was openly declared. What is more, the future peace treaties were anticipated, along with the League of Nations, explicitly revealing the subversive function they were to serve for the benefit of the secret forces of the Revolution. (Evola)

7 This is a French expression, which means roughly, ‘go to Hell’.—Ed.

8 As concerns Italy, it might be worth quoting the following passage from M. Rygier’s work *La Franc-Maçonnerie italienne devant la guerre et le fascisme* (Paris, 1929, p. 42): ‘Upon Italy’s entry into the war, the Great Orient sent a message to the Italian people, which had proven its loyalty. The draft of a text examined by the masonic authorities in charge emphasised the role played by the Great Orient in the interventionist campaign and the success this had met. These sentences, however, were removed from the final version of the text and replaced by a more conventional statement ... that the war just declared fulfilled the expectations and prophecies of the martyrs and prophets of the Risorgimento, whose teachings and conduct masonic lodges had always recommended to their members as a source of inspiration. If the Great Orient acted in this manner it was – as is attested in trials – out of concern for the sacred union: in order to make Catholics and especially the indifferent masses aware of the fact that the country’s soldiers were fighting and dying for a cause promoted by Freemasonry.’ (Evola)

9 Evola ends the sentence with, ‘a faceless part of the collective body’.—Ed.

10 Evola ends the sentence with ‘the Judeo-Bolshevik orgy’. He also omits the following paragraph.—Ed.

1919: The Peace Treaties – The Disruption of Europe and the League of Nations

The aim of the famous and pitiful Paris Conference was to legalise and consolidate the new conquests through a Jewish peace. These were not the conquests made by France, Britain, or Italy, which were but accessory factors; they rather consisted of revolutionary and democratic progress, which represented the essential aspect of it.

Many international congresses had already been held in the past: the Congress of Vienna in 1815, that of Paris in 1855, and Berlin in 1878, not to mention minor ones or those of previous centuries. The world, however, had never witnessed anything comparable to the Paris Conference of 1919.

It was presented not as a conference in which people would ‘confer’, discuss things, and negotiate, but as a sort of criminal court of history that would judge the whole world in the light of democracy.

Various regimes and historical outlooks were to be brought before this court as guilty parties or defendants. Individuals and peoples – the former filled with anxiety, the latter with hope – awaited the outcome of this great conference, as if it were the Final Judgement. Everything was to take place according to the Holy Scriptures, except for the following inversion: the good and righteous, the sheep and lambs, were to be found on the Left; the evil ones, or ‘goats’, on the Right, whence they would be plunged into Gehenna, amid tears and the grinding of teeth.

As there were no longer any warmongering princes or ambitious nobles to oppress the humble and disinherited, from that memorable moment onwards justice was expected to rule on Earth. In a perfected Eden blooming with ‘immortal principles’, with the fruits of the French Revolution and the *Communist Manifesto* as the only ones not forbidden, a new golden age would have dawned.

The Conference was a one-sided affair. In all its hearings, it acted as a court retiring to deliberate. The defendants, in other words the opposing party, were only allowed to stand before it to hear its verdict.

Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey were the ‘criminals’. After finally repenting of their sins against Jews and democracy, these states – much like medieval penitents – hopelessly awaited in the ‘darkness outside’ for the ‘Maundy Thursday’ on which they would have been admitted into the church of democracy.

On the other hand, states regarded as allies, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and even certain countries that had been part of the Entente,¹ like Romania and Serbia, found themselves in an uncertain situation. They were not members of the court and in a sense were not even members of the Conference, since they were the parties for which the latter was expected to grant justice. They awaited this justice passively, with no right to plead their cases except when explicitly invited to do so. They were like believers standing by the door, forbidden to enter the church.

The Paris Conference differs from previous congresses in many other respects as well. There were no longer any great men here – kings with their ministers, courtiers, and followers, which is to say privileged clans – to determine the fate of ‘unfortunate’ peoples by exchanging, partitioning, and distributing them ‘like cattle’, as would have been the case in ages of ‘obscurantism’ and ‘barbarism’. This time, progress seemed to mean that the various peoples themselves, free at last, could determine their own fate.

These peoples – over a hundred million Americans, a hundred and fifty million Europeans, and an even greater number of Asians, not to mention all the Africans and Australians – were therefore expected to speak through the voices of Wilson, Lloyd George, and Clemenceau in the halls of the Quai d’Orsay. The Paris Conference purported to be a free discussion among free and equal peoples.

In practice, it was what the British and Americans referred to as the ‘big three’ that ultimately made up the supreme court which was called to judge all the nations and individuals of the world.² This court was intended to pass judgement according to democratic justice, which is to say according to a new code completely independent from outdated things such as natural law, the Decalogue, and Roman law.

The new code was envisaged as an expression of ‘human progress’ beyond all that had come before in the history of civilisation. Hence, there could be no criteria above this new code, which could only be interpreted by the three great judges. If anyone else, even the Pope, had dared claim the same degree of infallibility as them, the whole world would no doubt have broken out in a cry of indignation. The claim to infallibility made by Lloyd George, Wilson, and Clemenceau was instead regarded as something quite legitimate on account of the fact that these three gentlemen allegedly acted not as individuals, but as ‘peoples’.

The Jewish or Judaised press – whose mission it is to influence public opinion and make people stoically bear the most absurd burdens – fed the incoherent masses this lie, which was quite readily swallowed.

The ‘big three’ were the only judges and interpreters of a new moral law whose canons did not even exist in writing, but which allegedly promoted the higher interests of democracy.

Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Wilson were thus invited to play a historically unprecedented role. The parliaments of the three fiercely parliamentary democracies which these gentlemen represented suddenly fell silent, as if ordered to do so: their spokesmen alone were allowed to slice Europe and part of Asia up like a pie.

All these men were concerned with was to please the Jew, who was about to ‘take the world by stride’! At any rate, everything took place as if this were their only concern at this fateful hour of history.

The work accomplished by the Paris Conference may be summed up as follows: first of all, it led to the creation of the largest possible number of sovereign nations, in other words the largest possible number of mutually conflicting interests – which could

nonetheless still have been reconciled to some degree; then, as if to rule out this chance of salvation, the Conference limited these nations, so that their interests, and in many cases vital needs, would indeed become mutually irreconcilable; finally, it established the League of Nations, a Platonic assembly lacking any power and incapable of imposing any sanctions – an assembly that meets no clear corporate interest and is entrusted with theoretically reconciling what is in practice irreconcilable for the longest possible time by simply playing on people's fear of things becoming even worse.

The chaos we presently have in Europe is not due, as is often claimed, to the evil nature or collective maliciousness of this or that political or ethnic group. Nor is it due, as people make a show of believing, to the rancour and hatred engendered by the War: for rancour of this sort is always a temporary thing and tends to wane after some time. The present state of Europe is simply the logical consequence of the situation and relations determined by the Paris Conference.

Consider how Hungary was dismembered for the benefit of Czechoslovakia and Romania, as had previously been done with Poland for the benefit of Russia, Prussia, and Austria before its third and last partition. Or again, consider the place of Hungary *vis-à-vis* the new tiny Austria, whose capital alone used to boast over a million and a half inhabitants. Neither country is self-sufficient and can import or export any goods unless Germany, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia grant them permission to pass through their territory.

On the other hand, Czechoslovakia itself, while pampered and helped in every possible way, and treated by Judeo-Masonic democracy as its love child, nonetheless finds itself in a position where it cannot breathe and cannot get in touch with the rest of the world except through the silver tunnel of the Elbe, a German river.

Germany, in turn, with its growing population and countless industries, is split in half by Poland and surrounded on all sides.

Poland, restored to the frontiers it had after its first partitioning, can only access the sea through an artificial corridor.

Italy, with its overflowing population, is cramped in its peninsula, with no other prospect of meeting its physical need for expansion than war.³

Wherever we may cast our gaze – provided we look at things with a scientific mind and eye, so as to discover their underlying causes – we shall soon realise that what we have is the compulsory war of all against all, potentially if not in act.

While privileged nations may not be engaging with one another in such drastic terms yet, they still find themselves in the equally difficult situation of being demanding creditors and debtors forced to bleed themselves dry by imposing new taxes in what is nothing but a form of socialisation.

This is the state of Europe in the aftermath of the War: a continent divided and organised in such a way as to make each country unbearable to all the rest. To complete this picture, however, we should add the socialism of the Muscovite East and the capitalism of the

American West, each of which is manipulated in its own way by the Jew, with both seeking to infiltrate themselves into all places in order to gain control of everything.

We must have the courage to admit that in the Europe crafted by the ingenious hand of the Paris Conference, more than ever before in history, the only common interest of all nations, both old and new, is war. If, despite this, we still have peace – a restless, burdensome, and armed peace, but peace nonetheless – it is only because the common interest of all nations finds a temporary counterbalance in their common fear. This fear, however, is progressively waning as the previous war becomes a thing of the past and new generations are born which never experienced it. By contrast, this interest and indeed vital need for war will be a constant thing for all nations for as long as the order established by the Paris Conference will endure.

All this is mathematically, or rather geometrically, certain. To realise it, it is enough to take a careful look at the map without losing sight of the most important thing: the fact that economic frontiers have been reduced to a corollary of political frontiers, as if the two were mutually inseparable.

Ultimately, none of the nations of Europe is satisfied with these treaties, yet they are all obsessed with the idea that any change would only worsen their situation. This idea is deeply set in all minds and prevents people from seeing things as they really are.

People tell themselves over and over that a complete revision of the treaties would only lead to a new war, or who knows what other catastrophe. They thus fail to realise that it is precisely these treaties which, sooner or later, will inevitably bring about a new cataclysm.

The work of the Paris Conference is as absurd as it is brilliant: it is absurd from the point of view of the interests of the overwhelming majority of men, but brilliant in every tiny respect for a certain category of individuals.

The overwhelming majority of men in France and Poland, including educated men, believe Germany to be the one plotting. According to the Germans, it is France and Britain that are doing the plotting – or even Italy, especially now that it has taken an openly anti-revolutionary stance.⁴

Moscow is simply brought up in relation to Communism: no mention is ever made of the backstage connections which Moscow has to all those around the world who have no enemies on the Left.

Once evidence of plotting has been found, it is always one's partner and neighbour who are accused, rarely the Soviet state and never the international Jew. This merely aggravates already existing disagreements and paves the way for future plotting that will again benefit the – supposedly non-existent – Jew⁵ and the Soviet state itself, which is always acquitted of any possible charge of involvement.

At the time of the French Revolution, people used to say that Freemasonry was a British institution in the service of Britain – which was only true to the extent that Britain indeed favoured the Revolution. In recent times, people in France have written that Freemasonry is a German institution in the service of Germany, which again is only true to the extent

that the Weimar Republic collaborated with the Israelite state to the east. The Germans, on the other hand, would have us believe that Freemasonry is an essentially French institution.

Similar considerations are being made concerning capitalism: the French claim that it is in the service of Germany; the Germans swear that it serves Britain; and almost everyone agrees that it serves the United States.

Largely the same assertions are being circulated about socialism: thus people will point out, for instance, that Marx and Lassalle, while Jewish, were nonetheless born in Germany.

Still, no one except 'conspiracy crackpots' apparently dare write that these countries are in fact the victims of Freemasonry, socialism, and capitalism, by which they are all being manipulated to various degrees.

Under these conditions, it is clear that the League of Nations can in no way represent a rallying point for European interests. At most, it might serve as a junction for all the plots and counter-plots, manoeuvres and counter-manoevres being made by large, medium, and small world powers. These countries ignore what might bring them together and are only aware of that which divides them. The European powers find themselves in this state of discord not through any fault of their own, but because a condition of irreparable and inevitable mutual division, animosity, and antagonism has been created by the immutable treaties of the Paris Conference.

It is claimed that the League of Nations is the embodiment of peace. But if that is so, it is only because the treaties of which it is the depository – and which it cannot change in the slightest, for indeed it can only comment upon them, just as the Church may authoritatively comment upon the Holy Scriptures – are being presented to us as the very essence of peace, whereas in fact they are nothing but seeds of future war.

The role of the League of Nations is that of a mystic body for perpetuating the spirit imposed by the acts of Versailles, Saint-Germain, Trianon, and Sèvres – 'final' acts that, to use a common expression, form the new Great Charter of humanity.

The Paris Conference adopted the language of Catholic logic while inverting its terms. Effects it always treated as causes and vice-versa. It always treated what is accidental as permanent, while dismissing things permanent as being merely accidental.

What is essential it treated as being accessory, and what is accessory as being essential. In order to show how the Conference focused its attention on only the most accidental and accessory issues, we need to take but one case into consideration.

Austria-Hungary was treated as the permanent and central evil. The Hapsburg empire, seen as the root of all ills, was struck off the map of Europe and erased from history.

Germany was regarded as a more accidental and accessory ill to be done away with: as one less important than Austria-Hungary, although more important than Russia. The latter was seen as a perfectly accidental, accessory, and indeed negligible problem – so much so

that it was dismissed.

Exactly the opposite is true. The real and deadly peril comes from Moscow, which poses a threat not unlike that of the plague in the Middle Ages: attempting to come to terms with it is sheer folly. As effects are inseparable from their causes, the peril and infection of Moscow cannot be suppressed by simply suppressing the outcome of the Judeo-Russian revolution.

The German peril was certainly real. Still, it was not essential, for – unlike the peril of Jewish Bolshevism – it did not stem from the essence of the German nation. The German peril was simply due to accidental factors, of which economic congestion was the most important. By solving this problem, the peril itself would have been averted.

By contrast, there was no such thing as an Austrian or Hapsburg threat. In order to make everyone happy, except of course a few ambitious rebels, it would have been enough to restore the ancient empire on a federal basis, as suggested by Archduke Franz Ferdinand, after assigning Galicia to Poland and the Italian provinces to Italy.

This example reveals something of crucial importance.

The work of the Paris Conference was not carried out carelessly by people acting on instinct who simply aimed to smooth things and get out of a difficult situation in whatever way they could. This was not – as superficial critics like to say – the work of men ignorant of geography and history.

On the contrary, the work of the Paris Conference was carefully planned down to the slightest detail. It strikes us as being imbued with historical universalism, yet it has in fact reversed all values for the benefit of the one current in history that represents the antithesis of the Catholic thesis.

The Hapsburg empire was completely suppressed because it was the one most in line with the Catholic thesis and most opposed to the Jewish antithesis.

Well into the twentieth century, the Hapsburg empire constituted an expression of the historically Catholic Pentecost that opposed the Tower of Babel of languages and races. It represented the unity in diversity of the Middle Ages, a reduced form of what the Holy Empire had sought to be during the Crusades – one still surviving in an age poisoned by the Reformation and the Revolution, with its nationalism, capitalism, and socialistic democracy.

In other words, the Hapsburg empire embodied what was most hateful to – and less compatible with – the products of Judaism and Freemasonry in shaping contemporary history.

The German empire, sprung from the Reformation and brought to completion by Frederick the Great's freethinking, a secular and civic empire, and hence a statist one, elicited far less hatred. Indeed, it ceased attracting any hatred at all the moment it did away with its princes and its vestiges of feudalism, which still endured despite capitalism and statism, and chose to recognise Luther, Kant, Hegel, and the Jew Marx as its only

forebears. When it then found an ingenious, if not brilliant, way of ensuring that it would become the ally, technical advisor, and organiser of the new Jewish state by force, the German empire even became something desirable and useful.⁶

Bound hand and foot to Jewry in the guise of Communism, hated Russia has become a sacred and untouchable country. When it is Russia that touches others, one cannot react, since it makes everything it lays its hands on inviolable.

In order to correctly evaluate the work of the Paris Conference, it must be gazed at from the Vatican Hill, the towers of the Kremlin, or the skyscrapers of Broadway – the only truly fixed places in the world. The work of the Conference will then strike us as a perfect construction lacking neither a sense of universality nor that of history. It is the work of architects who are perfectly aware of what they are building, and who act under inspiration from the Great Architect of the Universe, the highest figure in Masonic lodges.

This huge edifice is crowned by the League of Nations.

The genius who has presided over this global disruption is he whom Christ calls a ‘liar from the beginning’.

In completing the war for the creation of the new Babel known as the League of Nations and the various bodies which sprung from it, the work of the Paris Conference serves as a prologue for the world conspiracy of the twentieth century and as a bloody epilogue for that of the nineteenth century. Where one ends, the other starts.

Now it is time for us to cast our gaze on Bolshevism.

¹ In the First World War, the Triple Entente was an alliance consisting primarily of the British Empire, the French Third Republic, the United States, and the Russian Empire.—Ed.

² In theory, there was also a fourth actor: the Italian Prime Minister. Everyone knew, however, that his opinion mattered little. This is no doubt the reason why he ostentatiously left the Conference at a given moment, only to make his way back later. (Poncins) (Evola presents the note as follows: ‘To tell the truth, there was also a fourth actor: the Italian Prime Minister. But although Italy, at first neutral, had then sided with the Allies and thus made a crucial contribution to the outcome of the World War, the country’s voice was largely ignored in Paris. The Italian spokesman was actually forced to leave the conference at a given moment. Italy was later to become one of the first nations to embrace revisionism and stand up against the peace treaties.’—Ed.)

³ Evola has this paragraph as follows: ‘Despite being one of the winners of the conflict, Italy, with its overflowing population, was cramped in its peninsula and faced the prospect of having to wage war in Europe in order to meet its physical need for expansion. This prospect was indeed about to come true at the time of the conquest of Ethiopia, which took place despite the opposition of the League of Nations.’—Ed.

⁴ Evola omits the last part of the sentence, concerning Italy.—Ed.

⁵ Instead of ‘Jew’, Evola has ‘the occult front’.—Ed.

⁶ Evola rewrites this sentence as, ‘When it found an ingenious, if not brilliant, way of ensuring that the Jew would control all its vital cells (for such was Germany’s perspective in the immediate aftermath of the War and before National Socialism), Germany even became worthy of love, or at any rate desirable.’—Ed.

The Birth Pangs of Bolshevism: The Rise of Capitalism in Russia

The Russian Revolution of 1917 marked the penultimate stage in the plan to implement the ideas of the international Left. As such, it played a crucial role in the history of Subversion.

It is worth tracing the origins of this Revolution to find out how and why it spread in Russia. In order to do so, we must briefly examine the period of Russian history leading to the explosion of 1917.

Our readers will thereby come to know facts that the mainstream press has said nothing about, but which acquire particular significance now that we are hanging over the chasm that has opened up before our feet.

Two critical moments sealed the fate of the Russian dynasty and empire.

The first was when Alexander II chose to emancipate the serfs under such conditions that only emigration toward the east would have enabled emancipation to work.

The second moment was when Alexander III set out to industrialise his empire and thereby created two new social classes, the proletariat and the capitalists, which suddenly found themselves operating in terms of a collective economy.

With Alexander II's act, property belonging to farmers was separated from that of their old lords. This act assigned rural communes¹ enough hectares of land to support one generation. Its effects only became visible thirty years later, with the new generation, when Alexander III – following the alliance between Russia and France – was required to industrialise his country with the help of French capital in preparation for war.

This represented a novelty in the history of the Romanov empire that entailed many risks for the old system. Events unfolded without people actually realising that a substantial, and indeed crucial, change was taking place.

Following the pact between France and Russia, a flood of liquid capital swept into the empire of the Tsars.

This was all quite natural and to be expected, since economics responds to laws of its own that are as inescapable as those of physics.

From a physical perspective, Russia represented an empty space with no capital. Capital tends to behave as bodies do: it dreads emptiness. The Russia of those years may be compared to a large, hermetically sealed room whose air is rarefied and whose walls are covered by the condensed atmosphere of its surroundings.

This monetary atmosphere was nowhere as condensed as in France, the foremost country in terms of savings. Its inhabitants, both rich and poor, saved far more money than they

spent, and so their chief concern was to find new investments for their ever-increasing funds.

The sort of investments that used to be known in France as ‘heads of family’ would pay six or seven percent. The safest investment of all, which was apparently guaranteed by all the alleged resources of the Empire, were government stocks, which would pay four percent.

These were highly appealing rates, compared to those which people were used to. Middle-class Frenchmen swooned at the prospect of doubling their revenues without the slightest risk. The apparent solidness of the giant which had outdone Napoleon’s genius filled the French with blind confidence: for they did not know that it was standing on clay feet.

The small savers, however, whose ignorance of geography is well known, felt an instinctual mistrust towards anything beyond their country’s borders.

It was necessary for their government to announce that their fears were unfounded, and that by making this investment they would be killing two birds with one stone. Aside from doubling their revenues, French savers would be paying an acknowledged service to their own country: thanks to the formidable support which the Russian giant would give France in the case of war with Germany under these conditions, these people would be ensuring the safety of their homeland and hence their own.

With the famous ‘steamroller’ on one’s side, things would no longer happen as they had in 1870. Hesitation was not an option: all purses and penny banks between the Pyrenees and the Vosges, between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, were emptied in a bout of indescribable enthusiasm.

A capitalist wind of unusual force thus started blowing from the west to the east.

Wind of this sort usually brings rain, but in this case it was a shower of gold that France rained upon Russia – a country which was as dry as a desert in this respect.

Naturally, the Russians were delighted to receive this downpour. The delight was shared by landowners as much as the bourgeoisie. It was the former, in particular, who rejoiced, because life in the countryside did not cost more than it used to, and it was time for things to change there. Landowners started selling their produce for more, so that without acquiring any new property they miraculously became richer, as if in a fairy tale.

We have personally met a Russian landowner who received five hundred thousand roubles for the felling of his trees. When he had first inherited his property, which included more than just the forest, it had been evaluated at fifty thousand roubles and its annual yield was no more than one point five percent of this sum. With the half a million roubles this owner obtained, he purchased some papers that returned six percent. The house, fields, pastures, and vegetable garden – what he needs to support himself in the countryside – he kept; and what is more, in fifty years or so his heirs will have a newly-planted forest.²

Previously, very few men in Russia had grown rich in this way, by operating conjuring tricks with scribbles on paper. People who did so used to be contemptuously called ‘birds of the sky’ – an allusion to the birds that, according to the Gospel, our good Lord feeds without them ever having to sow, gather, or store anything. This shows just how much aversion Russian landowners used to have for capitalist methods.

This new manner of acting and living seemed magnificent. It was Russia’s honeymoon for the holy matrimony it had contracted with Capitalism – behind which the Jew was hiding in wait of his prey. To celebrate the marriage in style, sumptuous banquets were held, filled with champagne and vodka. People genuinely believed to have found the secret formula for changing water into wine, as Christ had done at Cana. No one – not even the Tsar and his advisors (except a few perhaps, whom we shall mention later) – realised that something crucial had changed. People failed to see that a real revolution was taking place, one without which the revolution of 1917 would never have been possible.

The good old times in which each man was the master of his house and God alone the master of all were dead and gone.

The state became the one responsible for pumping blood through the arteries of the country in the form of money – which had suddenly become something indispensable. Russia thus ceased to be a chequerboard of autonomous units and individual liberties. The state took the form of a single economic and social body. Once in debt, it was forced to gain effective control over the country, not in order to increase its output of those resources directly and genuinely necessary for life, but to produce the constituent elements of capital and credit, without which it now seemed quite impossible to manufacture anything.

The Tsarist regime had not expressly wished any of these changes, which flew in the face of its tradition and patriarchal heritage. Yet, the new state of affairs followed as an inevitable consequence of the hasty industrialisation of the country, pursued on the basis of political considerations about the possibility of future war. The only starting point for this industrialisation was the foreign credit which had been explicitly given for such purpose. Given these conditions, the new industry lacked any natural support in the form of land capable of feeding its workers and of furnishing them with what they needed without resorting to endless transactions. Consequently, both employers and employees lacked any immediate means for subsistence.

Things could not have been any different for an industry based on credit, whose workers, managers, and direct or indirect backers no longer lived off the land. In the countryside, by contrast, where people continued to support themselves through farming, as in the past, employers and employees could have continued collaborating – as their fathers had done – without the intermediation of money. Yet psychological factors came into play: people were no longer satisfied with the old way of doing things.

By now, human relations had turned into relations between creditors and debtors. Brass, silver, gold, and paper bills came between men as soon as these were divided into two categories. In the books of so-called double-entry accounting, figures split even

individuals into two, making them creditors and debtors at one and the same time. The damage done was irreparable.

1 Evola adds, ‘the so-called *mir*’.—Ed.

2 Evola omits this entire paragraph.—Ed.

Stolypin's Economic Reform

Just before the War, a providential man appeared who might yet have fixed the situation.

Nicholas II, who never accomplished a thing, had finally found a man up to the task: Stolypin. Had this man not been killed, he would have saved Russia – and with it, perhaps, the world – from the subtle plague of the soul.

The tale of these events is still clouded by passions and distorted by shameless propaganda. But the day will come in which justice will be given to Stolypin by assigning him a rightful place among the great builders of empires.

We shall focus for a moment on this great witness to the 'twilight of the gods' whom a Jew's bullet prevented from implementing a plan more fruitful than that of Peter the Great and Catherine the Great. These two sovereigns had built a vast empire which was ultimately nothing but a giant standing on clay feet. To judge from the political, economic, and social work Stolypin carried out in the short period between June 1906 and September 1911, fifteen or twenty years of external peace would have sufficed for this providential man to build a great nation and people in place of all the chaos and incoherence he had found.

Stolypin hailed from an old noble family belonging to the great landed aristocracy. Ever since he was a child, he had been steeped in feudal tradition. His blood thus led him to gaze back at a past that was dear to him.

Stolypin's mind, on the other hand, was open to the future: hence, he was the very opposite of those reactionaries – in the literal sense of the term – who, with their narrow minds, instinctively react against all that is new and blindly cling to outdated forms without knowing how to separate the wheat from the chaff.¹

This feudal gentleman, the son of a great chamberlain of the court, spent his whole life fighting both against the people of his own class, who saw him as a dangerous innovator and man of progress (which he indeed was, in the literal sense of the term), and of course against the champions of alleged democratic progress, who rightly regarded him as the worst enemy they had ever beheld and the most serious threat to their evil plans.

While of pure Russian stock, the Stolypin family owned some land in the province of Kovno. It was there that the future man of state began his political career.

Stolypin managed to bring stability to a milieu in which misery, resentment, and mutual mistrust – caused by the Revolution of 1905 – left no room for any corporate² spirit of social collaboration.

Within a few years of efforts, Stolypin did such a great job at easing relations among classes and races that he came to the attention of Nicholas II, who was very worried by the agrarian question. The Tsar appointed Stolypin governor of the province of Grodno, which borders Kovno and is home to an ethnically mixed population of Poles, White Rusyns, Jews, and Russians.

As the new governor, Stolypin was not much of a bureaucrat. He instead made brilliant use of his skills as a man of social action, focusing in particular on an in-depth study of the agrarian problem, which he regarded as the Gordian knot of the Tsarist empire.

The political situation had taken a very dangerous turn. The Revolution of 1905 had broken out, and peasant revolts were ravaging the Volga regions. Stolypin was forced to quit his peaceful work in Grodno and take command of the province of Saratov, which lay at the very centre of the uprising.

His was a place of honour and combat – a test of fire both in the literal and metaphorical sense.

Stolypin gave proof of qualities that immediately made him stand out among those serving the threatened regime.

To shed light on the problem, he did not turn to the books and pamphlets written by those undercover villains who claim to be voicing the grievances of the people. Rather, he personally made enquiries among the people themselves – those folk he had been in regular contact with ever since his childhood and which he regarded not as some sort of myth, but as a body comprised of living individuals. Everywhere Stolypin received the same response from the mouth of the people – which alone was authorised to speak in its own name.

Let us here quote the daughter of the future reformer, who reported one of the replies she once happened to overhear:

‘They said it was true that pillaging and ransacking wasn’t going to solve a thing. When my father asked them why they were then behaving in such a way, one of them answered, with approval from all his fellows: “What I would like is a piece of blue paper with the imperial coat of arms assigning me and my family full ownership over a small plot of land. I could pay for it over time: thank God, people work in my family. But what is the point of working at the moment? You love your land, try to farm it the best you can, better than all others, and then they come and take it away from you – after you have put your heart and soul into it; they give it to someone else, and the following year the commune sends you to work somewhere else. What I am telling Your Excellency is true and many of my mates agree: why bother? Life is already dull as it is, Your Excellency!”’

Alexandra Stolypin adds:

‘My father was very sorry to hear all this. “Poor Russia, a country of wood and thatch,” he would often say. In his mind he would picture the thriving farms of nearby Germany: in what were tiny plots of land compared to our vast plains, serene and tenacious men amassed produce and wealth generation after generation. Turning his gaze toward the Urals, in his mind he would then traverse the long prisoners’ route across the Asian Russian empire: all of nature’s treasures lay buried there in virgin soil, immersed in their ancient slumber...’

We have quoted this lengthy passage because it sums up the whole story of the origins of

the Russian cataclysm, a subject to which many books in all languages have been devoted.

It is fair to say that everyone in Russia had heard this voice, but that only one man chose to listen to it. And this is why he was such a great man. For the same reason, this Christian and loyal servant of the throne, this autocrat by birth and feudal gentleman by persuasion and temperament, may be said to have been the only real democrat – him, and not Witte, Bakunin, Miliukov, Chernov, Kerensky, Lenin, Trotsky, or any of all the other anonymous sympathisers of democracy, be they Russian, Western, or American.

By then, the path Stolypin was to follow until his death had been traced. Knowing that sins against the spirit of evil are never pardoned in this world, he chose to sacrifice his own life to his vocation of tirelessly working for the happiness of the Russian people.

This great landowner never lost sight of the fact that Russia – and more generally what is referred to as one's fatherland (literally, 'the land of one's fathers') – ought not turn into a branch of international business and a consortium for smooth financial transactions; but, on the contrary, that it ought to represent one's heritage and land, a great land to be put to good use for the benefit of its inhabitants.

In line with what is written in the Gospel, when Stolypin was required to put his skills and faith to the test in a small arena, he did not hesitate to do so.

Time was working in his favour and his day – destined to be a short one – was rapidly approaching. As soon as the dissolution of the Duma was announced, Goremykin – a man of another age who was not ready to face such events – resigned. His successor was bound to be the only man who had chosen a different path: Stolypin.

The new head of the government enjoyed the trust of his sovereign, and justifiably so. Both ultimately shared the same ideas, but the Tsar, a fearful and hesitant man, did not know how to go about implementing them. Stolypin was practically invested with quasi-dictatorial powers.

Fate was offering him the chance to fulfil his life's dream. Few men have such fortune in this world. Stolypin felt that he would pay for this great opportunity with his own life. This foreboding, or rather well-founded certainty, was always at the back of his mind. He even told his family about it: for he was quite conscious of what Enemy he was challenging, and indeed certain that this Enemy would not hesitate to kill him in order to prevent him from spoiling their Satanic plan.

For this reason, Stolypin tried not to waste a single minute. Postponing the creation of a new electoral law, he went straight for his goal.

The most urgent task was to sever the Gordian knot that tied Russia to those causes which were driving it toward the abyss – not to discuss how one might go about untying it. These causes were simple ones, as are all first, primal causes.

The chief cause of disorder in Russia was ferment and exasperation among the people. No revolution in history has ever had any other initial motive behind it. Even in the case of revolutions classified as religious, denominational factors are usually only what sparks

the flames – not the fuel without which no blazing fire would be possible.

The primary cause of the people's exasperation was their misery. They were caught in a deadlock because they were expected to live off what they sowed and reaped, and yet no longer had any land on which to sow or reap after a decree had disenfranchised the serfs. The situation was growing increasingly worse from one generation to the next.

The primary cause of the exasperation and ferment among the people was therefore quite clear and perfectly natural. If anything was certain and evident, it was the fact that there were no other causes. Sure, professors, lawyers, and journalists in Paris and London – or even Saint Petersburg and Moscow – were told that what tantalised the Russian people was the desire to have democratic institutions. But country gentlemen such as Stolypin – or even men far less sagacious than him – could hardly buy these tales.

Once the problem has been posed in these terms, it remains to be ascertained whether this initial cause – this deadlock of the masses – might have been done away with for good without first having to grant constitutions, convene parliaments, and hand over the press to Jewish capitalists. Had it been possible to do without such restrictions, the primary cause – the exasperation of the masses – would have been automatically suppressed. It is clear that this cause could indeed have been easily removed, at least for one century. Russia would have found itself in a most fortunate and privileged position.

Homeland and colony at one and the same time (the colony being but an extension of the homeland), Russia had enough resources not only to feed several times its own population, but also to provide its inhabitants with all they needed to become small landowners. The only requirement would have been for it to gradually extend eastwards in a planned fashion.

To attain this magnificent goal, there would have been no need to rob anyone; in fact, alongside small properties there would have been plenty of scope for the creation of new medium- and large-scale domains. Would there have been the need – as had once been claimed elsewhere, in different circumstances – 'for money, more money, always money'?

Well, not really: Russia was still a newcomer to the capitalist system, and most of its inhabitants were still doing happily without any currency. Besides, even supposing this had been the problem, with all the money Witte³ had managed to borrow, there would have been plenty of funds to colonise and manage a portion of the Asian Russian empire of a large enough size to avert the threat of agrarian congestion for quite some time. Indeed, capital would never have been invested in a more useful and advantageous manner – with costs soon to be amortised and the prospect of countless benefits in the future.

Without the hindrance of a democratic constitution, without any hostile and treacherous collaboration from frenzied parliaments, and without having to allow Jews and social turmoil maniacs to dishearten the people through the so-called free press, the Tsarist government had everything it needed, in a material sense, to completely eradicate the only decisive causes of the approaching cataclysm.

The Tsar could thus have suppressed the very *raison d'être* of all future revolutions once

and for all. Had he done so, we can confidently claim that neither the War nor the Bolshevik Revolution would have taken place.

Stolypin's merit does not lie so much in having understood all this: for many others, especially among the landowners, reasoned along much the same lines. Stolypin, however, was the only one in half a century to have drawn the logical conclusions by immediately taking action.

After a mere four months since Stolypin had come to power, a new agrarian law was passed by imperial decree, establishing private property for farmers. This memorable event bears the date of 9 November 1906.

Alexander II's mistake was thus at least partly rectified. Farmers were now given the right – and indeed the opportunity – to break free from servitude under the commune, which had replaced that they had known under the landowners.

The farmers' agrarian bank – a special institution that was already in existence, but until then had simply been operating as a sort of tool for Russifying foreign regions – purchased lands at a low cost. Adding these properties to those already belonging to the state, the bank put them to public use, enabling each farmer to buy a plot on credit after announcing that he was freely leaving the commune. Each farmer would only pay the bank what money he had, as the imperial treasury would make up the difference.

Almost immediately, half a million heads of family came into possession of almost four million hectares.

This was in practice when serfdom was finally abolished. Yet, because it did not mark any 'progress' towards collective socialist economy, but rather was a 'regression' toward individualism and private economy, this event did not have the same literary and theatrical resonance as Alexander II's reform. Enthusiastically welcomed by the people, it was hardly appreciated by their alleged friends, advocates, and spokesmen – who treated the people as some sort of myth. It was also given a disconcertingly lukewarm reception by liberals and their press. As for the foreign press, it merely looked on in almost complete silence.

In the eyes of this press, Stolypin was a reactionary obscurantist and tyrant – why, it couldn't quite tell. Certainly, had Stolypin given over all land to be managed by an anonymous Jewish company in the name of the people – according to Communist or socialist practice – he would have been described in very different terms.

Confident in what he had done, Stolypin continued along his path, ignoring all the barking dogs. In just a few years – and we have witnessed this with our own eyes – European Russia, as if under the protection of a good fairy, became filled with a growing number of small, wealthy, and happy farms.

This was only the beginning. In setting out to transform one-sixth of the world, Stolypin had a far greater plan in mind. To buy property at a fair price and then sell it under more advantageous conditions, in such a way as to cover the inevitable deficit of the treasury which was created by the taxpayers, was clearly a plan geared toward social solidarity.

Ultimately, it meant artificially supporting the unemployed at the expense of the state, through taxes. Yet Stolypin's plan would not have brought only financial losses, for it was based on the hope – almost the certainty – of making up for these losses in the future.

This strategy, of course, would not have increased the wealth of the nation. While on the whole this would have remained largely the same, there would have been a decrease from the point of view of the country's yield. Manorial estates, which were cultivated and managed in a more intelligent way, were more productive: their parcelling – even if only partial and carried out in a perfectly honest spirit – could hardly be expected to contribute to the country's exports; in fact, it had the exact opposite effect. Still, good business – if we may use this expression which capitalism has distorted – consists of man's triumph over matter and energy, not over his neighbours.

In a country in which the farmers' agricultural methods were outdated, the transfer of lands which had already been exploited and cultivated from one person to another – or rather several others – was bad, in general economic terms. But Stolypin's approach was only an expedient aimed at curbing the immediate effects of subversion, in such a way as to buy some time and secure at least what little peace was necessary for him to carry out his ambitious plan.

Stolypin's major idea, which was of far broader import, was to put what we might call the virgin lands of the eastern and Asiatic part of the empire to good use. To attain this goal, he first needed to pave the way for it, chiefly by improving the existing means of communication. Otherwise, he would have acted like those overly hasty imitators of the West, who end up with a fruit that is already rotten before having even reached maturity, as the story goes.⁴

These problems, therefore, had to be solved through careful planning.

Stolypin was first of all concerned with agriculture, which provides the essentials for life and averts the danger of hunger – the prelude to all revolutions. After this came transport and communication routes, which enable agricultural regions to supply those with little Sun, while at the same time enabling the latter – which may be rich in other resources – to furnish the former with the materials they need to increase their agricultural yield. Finally, there is mining and what little industry is needed to meet the fundamental needs of man and the land without having to call upon help from the outside. The main purpose of this industry was not to export any goods or nourish the banks through commerce, but to provide agricultural implements, so that the whole economy would take the form of a closed circuit, so to speak.

Only once this ground floor – the foundations of Stolypin's economic plan – would have proven solid enough to support a superstructure would the upper floor have been constructed, in the form of large industry. Such industry, however, would not have been wildly expanded according to offers of credit, but only developed in accordance with the availability of raw materials – envisaged as the starting point – as well as the demand for finished products.

Indeed, industry must follow the extraction of raw materials in agriculture and mining –

never precede it. To act otherwise is to put the cart before the horse. Our generation, more than any other, knows all too well what a system of this kind leads to.

The criterion of harmony also applies to economics. An ideal national economy – or private economy, for that matter – is one that leaves nothing undone which can be accomplished without external aid.

Stolypin realised that only under these conditions could a perfect economic model be developed, one shielded from the vicissitude of external events and financial plotting. This is not to say that finance would necessarily have been excluded from this economic model. The latter would have made use of it to the extent to which it was convenient, without depending upon finance or being at its mercy: for an economy that is not sustained by finance is like a person hanging from a rope in the claws of the Jew.

For the most part, we owe the Trans-Siberian Railway to Mr Witte. This railway – the longest one on Earth – is an imposing work that honours the person who conceived it and oversaw its construction. Still, it is curious to note to what extent it bears the stamp of a man as steeped in capitalist ideas as Witte. The Trans-Siberian does not run across the wealthiest portions of the Asian Russian empire, those which would be the most suited for internal immigration and most likely to become local production centres. The main purpose of this formidable railway – its genuine *raison d'être* – rather appears to be that of providing the shortest possible route to connect the densely populated regions of western Russia – and via them, Europe – to China and the Pacific Ocean, in such a way as to open up a window on another sea for the descendants of Peter the Great.

With its boundless riches still waiting to be explored and exploited, and stretching for thousands of kilometres, Siberia had merely been regarded in this framework as an obstacle to be overcome – the main concern being transport, commerce, and financial interests.

The apparently similar work that Stolypin had in mind – but which an untimely death prevented him from fully accomplishing – was actually of a completely different sort. The Southern Trans-Siberian ran across the most fertile regions, those most suited for internal colonisation. While shorter than the other railway, it was still the second-longest one in Europe.

The creation of the first Trans-Siberian had been met with enthusiasm by the European press because it had shortened the distance between the headquarters of the financial institutions in Paris, London, and Berlin and their Peking or Shanghai branches. This same press, by contrast, hardly ever mentioned the colossal project of the second railway. The reason for this is that the creation of the Southern Trans-Siberian was only of genuine importance to the Russian people. The latter, however, was presented as being mercilessly exploited by its greatest benefactor, while its impersonal name was used to conceal the aspirations of Israel, in whose way stood the Tsar.

A quick look at statistics will help make things clearer.

In 1895, after three hundred years of Russian rule, Siberia – which covers a far wider

surface than the whole of Europe – was inhabited by 4,000,000 people, some of whom were descended from deported political prisoners or ordinary criminals. Between 1895 and 1907, in other words from the opening of the first Trans-Siberian to Stolypin's rise to power, this population increased by 1,500,000. In the three following years, under Stolypin's administration, it increased by almost 2,000,000, despite the fact that the new railway had not yet been completed.

Had this reasonable pace been kept up, by 1922 the population of Siberia would have increased by 10,000,000. Indeed, thanks to the new railway and to the fact that the Russians would have stirred from their age-old apathy under a government which devoted all its energy to this task, it is likely that this figure would soon have multiplied by a factor of three or four.

According to the estimates we were given by people close to the former Prime Minister, the Russian emigrant population in Siberia and Turkestan during the years 1920-30 ought to have reached a figure between 30 and 40,000,000. These would not have been thirty or forty million teeth-gritting, barefooted proletarians fighting for a miserable wage, but thirty or forty million small landowners: well-off, prosperous men who would have had more land and natural resources than most French farmers. Thirty or forty million men leading happy lives, confident of their future, satisfied with their lot and enjoying the highest possible degree of economic independence would have constituted a formidable barrier against any sort of revolution: in no country in the world is such a powerful conservative and reactionary force to be found today.

The only unquestionable benefit brought by the French Revolution was the improvement of the economic conditions of the peasant class. God knows how often this refrain is used and abused today to excuse the abominations of the Revolution. At the cost of what blatant robberies and glaring injustices was this improvement achieved?

Without harming a soul or ever departing from the most scrupulous morality and legality, Stolypin took a path which would have led directly to a far more considerable outcome.

¹ Evola omits the following five paragraphs from his edition.—Ed.

² Corporate, in the sense of a type of society in which citizens are organised into groups based on the function they perform for the body of the entire society itself, such as agriculture, the military, or administration.—Ed.

³ Sergei Witte (1849-1915) was an advisor to the last two Tsars of Russia. He oversaw the industrialisation of Russia and was the author of the 1905 *October Manifesto*, which was written in response to the Revolution of 1905 and the subsequent need for democratic reforms, and was the precursor to the Russian Empire's constitution.—Ed.

⁴ Evola omits this last sentence.—Ed.

Stolypin's Work: Capitalism and Property

Stolypin was not only the creator of countless estates, but also of what necessarily came with them, namely, as many individual liberties. The *bête noire* of liberal parties was in fact a great liberal, in that he created millions of free and independent men.

And it is not in spite of the fact that Stolypin was a feudal gentleman by breeding down to the very marrow of his bones, but precisely *because of this*, that he acted the way he did. His aim was to make the feudalism he loved a blessing for the whole nation rather than the exclusive privilege of one class, as it had been in the Middle Ages. The only people who will find what we are saying paradoxical will be those who struggle to grasp the true nature of feudalism, and only see its limits and shortcomings.

The detractors of the old regimes, whose job consists of distorting historical facts, have managed to confuse two completely different things: feudalism and servitude. Whereas the former reflects the relation between lords and their sovereign, or the mutual relation among lords, the latter describes the lords' relation to the peasants, their serfs.

Feudalism is a specific product of the Christian Middle Ages, by virtue of which all members of the landed aristocracy, including minor country squires, exercise independent sovereignty over their own lands – just as an emperor or king does over his territory. An emperor or king will be the suzerain of noblemen, but not their master. They, in turn, will not be his slaves, but rather his soldiers and military cadres, and this for their own personal safety – for each of them individually could never adequately defend himself in the event of conflict with other nobles or another king.

In modern terms, feudalism was a federation of independent owners with shared interests who held sovereignty over their domains – a federation ensuring the safety of each of its members. The one who wielded the greatest power by virtue of inheritance presided over the federation – as one might say nowadays. This person was an emperor or king, the suzerain of princes and dukes. Each of these princes or dukes, as intermediaries in the hierarchy, exercised the same role *vis à vis* the lower strata of the aristocracy.

All of Stolypin's efforts were directed at turning each man of the people into a small, independent lord and individual sovereign within his own domain, like a baron of the Middle Ages. Like barons, these men would have become vassals and tributaries of the crown: they would have been expected to obey its laws and conform to the rules of the Christian faith. They would have offered certain services to the king and received certain benefits in exchange. By contrast, the French Revolution had striven to turn each man of the people into an interdependent member and ideal representative of a collective, impersonal, and anonymous form of sovereignty.

Stolypin's idea was to create an individualist and decentralised society founded on private property. The idea of modern democracy is instead to create a collective and centralised society founded on anonymous capital.

Stolypin tried to push Christian feudalism to its final consequences through a process of

ennoblement and de-proletarianisation extending to the very bottom, just as the Revolution had pushed pagan democracy to its final consequences through a process of proletarianisation extending to the very top.

The tree planted by the revolutions to undermine feudalism (instead of extending it to the whole of humanity, as needed to be done) is the capitalist system, and its fruits are poisonous ones. We will die from them, since we cannot continue to live in this absurd manner forever.

We shall perish because the first commandment of our mercantile civilisation, created by Jews for Jews, is to only eat what has been purchased with money, after having sold what one has produced to get this money.

The outcome of this process is an extraordinary vicious circle. On the one hand there are people who are suffering from hunger because they are not able to sell their labour in return for money, which they can use to purchase food. On the other hand, there are people who are destroying their food stocks because they are not able to find anyone to sell them to in return for money which they can then use to purchase the labour of the aforementioned men, who would then have some money to buy food.

It is forbidden to live in any other way except through money. It is forbidden to produce what would enable one to live without it. Never have regulations been more strictly followed, nor conventions more carefully observed.

What we have is a country overflowing with essential goods in which half of the population lacks food, housing, clothes, or fuel, as it does not have any money for purchasing the things it needs. It could only get this money by selling its labour to the other half of the population, which is also short of money because – as we have seen – it suffers from an overabundance of essential goods which it cannot sell.

The state is quite rightly alarmed at the thought that those who have nothing, like a pack of hungry dogs, may end up attacking those who are suffering from an overabundance of goods. So it decides to act – just how, we shall now see.

The state collects the taxes paid by the rich, or rather those classified as rich – those suffering from overabundance. But these, as we have seen, are overflowing with anything but money, as they cannot sell their actual goods. They might consider themselves lucky if they manage to pay off the Shylock funding them and avoid declaring bankruptcy.

What the state is in urgent need of are rather supplies to feed the hungry, and clothes to dress those who are cold. It should ask the rich, then, who are overwhelmed by their abundance, not for the money they do not have, but for part of the stocks they do not know how to dispose of, and which would provide exactly what the poor need.

This solution would appear to be the most rational one, in economic terms. It would have the advantage of benefitting both parties, in other words the vast majority of humanity and its most significant minority. In quantitative and qualitative terms, this would include the people who produce through their work and those who produce by making others work. Yet, because a similar solution would go against the tiny minority of vultures who neither

sow nor reap, neither work nor make others work, but simply grow rich through the frenzied circulation of capital, the modern capitalist state prefers to adopt a different solution, one that beats all records of strangeness.

What the state does is ask those taxpayers who are overflowing with the goods the unemployed need for the only thing they lack: money. It forces them to sell some of their stocks at a low price to the aforementioned vultures, so that they end up being in even less of a position to offer workers any jobs. These cheap stocks the vultures then immediately sell at a high price to the unemployed, who purchase them with the money the state has taken from the producers of the goods.

The balance of this ingenious operation is most edifying: sheer loss for producers and employers, who sell their goods at a low price for the benefit of parasites; sheer loss for the unemployed, who purchase goods at a high price for the profit of the said parasites; and, finally, sheer loss for the state as well – adding to its other inevitable losses – along with a predictable rise in future unemployment rates. On the other hand, this operation means profit all round for the only middlemen manipulating the currency – in short, the absolute triumph of merchants and Jews, with the prospect of things automatically continuing in the same direction.

The misery of the workers, the ruin of those giving them jobs, the bankruptcy of the state and the threat of social turmoil are all considered preferable to the idea of giving up the intermediation of money – as if there could be no hope for humanity outside the capitalist system.

It cannot be denied that among these rancorous victims there is a steadily growing (and hence threatening) number of people who are already brandishing axes out of the burning, and indeed even legitimate and understandable, desire to fell this poisonous trunk – poisonous for all, that is, except the Jews and their acolytes.

One would be only too happy to lend these men a hand, were they proposing anything other than what other Jews paid by and accomplice to the former ones are whispering in their ears.

As might be expected, what the Jews are suggesting for Christians to do against other Jews as a way of redeeming the capitalist sin is actually – under the guise of a supreme remedy – the most colossal exacerbation of the same ill, namely: the despotic and universal pan-capitalism that, under the name of Communism, has been raging in Russia for over fifteen years,¹ bringing material misery, moral decadence, and complete servitude to 150 million people.

One is led to wonder whether there is any solution for humanity outside these two alternatives, the most recent of which is even worse than the old one.

Indeed, there is, and it consists of the pure and simple return to the path we have abandoned, namely property ownership of a feudal type, in which what matter are objects and living people – not figures and symbols. This time, the feudal regime could not operate for the exclusive benefit of a privileged class: whole communities – or, to be more

accurate, the countless individuals comprising them – would have to benefit from the system.

Herein lies the profound significance of the political, economic, and social experiment that Stolypin embarked upon between 1906, the date of his coming to power, and 1911, the date of his assassination.

We should add that, in order for a similar project to be feasible, it was not enough for there to simply be a man like Stolypin capable of implementing it: what was also required was a territory sufficiently vast in relation to the number of its inhabitants. And such was the Russian Empire.

Another advantage that should not be overlooked is the fact that the Russian people had not yet fully assimilated the capitalist mentality, which is so difficult to eradicate, and that, for the most part, it had not completely lost the habit of obeying.

Besides, it is most likely that Stolypin would never have conceived a project of this sort had he been a French, British, Italian, or American minister. To do so, one needed to have the old sense of property ownership running through one's veins; and in Western countries, even among the heirs of feudal families, this feeling had already been lost after a century of capitalist habituation.

Nowadays, people will hardly understand us if we say that, between a landowner and a king, or one's inheritance and one's country, there is only a difference of degree on the same scale of values. Indeed, for modern man, a landowner is only a type of capitalist; an inheritance, an investment of capital; a king, a magistrate in office; and one's country, an idealised consortium or trading post.

Stolypin, by contrast, had this innate feeling, which is becoming rarer and rarer nowadays. This is what made him a most formidable champion of economic and social conceptions which were radically opposed to those which emerged from the Reformation and the French Revolution. He was so formidable an adversary, in fact, that he was bound to be assassinated. Had he lived and governed for thirty years or so, and if peace in Europe had not been broken, it is most likely that he would have turned the anarchical and chaotic Russia of his day into an unprecedented masterpiece. Any comparison with democracies would have been rather unflattering for the latter: governed by collective economy, democracies owed their prestige and the fetishism they were made the object of to the fact that conservatives – or at any rate people labelled as such – had no better alternative to opt for.

The Russia Stolypin had in mind would not have been simply a federation of small farms: it would also have included middle-size and large estates. It is worth stressing this point, as it stands in open contrast to the blind belief according to which all men must necessarily be equal and alike.

As one might guess, Stolypin was not opposing the men of his class – the large landowners. Very wisely, he wished to create new large properties that could act as gravitational centres for the constellations of small properties in all the areas affected by

his reform.

Stolypin necessarily envisaged these new large estates as models of high culture and sources of far more effective moral influence upon surrounding peasant communities than the bureaucracy he quite rightly distrusted – for he was conscious of its corrupt nature and concealed revolutionary tendencies. Stolypin deemed the establishment of new large estates essential because he saw them as the starting point for a future process of industrialisation. He acknowledged the crucial importance of this process for a modern nation destined to become – because capable of doing so – the one country least dependent upon others, and at the same time that which others had most need of.

Still, Stolypin did not envisage this process of industrialisation in the same terms as his predecessor Witte had done, which is to say as a process based on conquest at the hands of anonymous capital and international Jewry of what Russian territory still remained unexplored, so as to turn it into an area of economic penetration, if not colonisation. Stolypin rather saw this process as a form of productive mutual cooperation between large estates on the one hand and the workers and resources of the small estates on the other. At the same time, he did not disregard the possibility that, especially in the first phase, support might potentially come from easily and swiftly redeemable capital. In this order of things, as in many others, there is nothing as dire as to neglect opportunities by stubbornly sticking to a rigid principle.²

Stolypin had long been acquainted with the sugar factories owned by country gentlemen in Ukraine. Each landowner would manage more than one plant – up to ten, at times – without incurring any debts to cover investments costs, without depending upon the market for the acquisition of raw material (for he would use his own beetroot, or those of his neighbour, through special arrangements), and without the help of any workforce other than farmers from surrounding areas. This was quite enough to make Russia one of the world's leading exporters of sugar.

Much in the same way, the country gentlemen who farmed sheep had set up wool industries without ever depending upon faraway investors or creditors. The owners of large forests had likewise set up sawmills and other workshops, such as paper factories (for which wood represents a primary resource).

Others had gotten together with relatives, friends, neighbours, or other partners – hereditary landowners themselves – and created important industries all over the country.

In Livonia and Courland – the province of Kovno in present-day Latvia – Stolypin had had many a chance to study the holdings established by the Baltic barons, admirable pockets of Western culture (in the best possible sense of the term). Here too, industry had done its best to accomplish the work of agriculture without any external help – hence without people forgoing their independence or running the slightest risk.

The principle generally followed by country gentlemen was the idea that the best and most logical investment of net revenue is not done through banks or by purchasing stocks and bonds for a business managed by unknown people God knows where. The best investment, they reckoned, was their own ancestral land, the object of their affectionate

attention and legitimate pride. From father to son, they would try to improve it and make it more attractive, as kings might do with their kingdoms: for they were not birds of passage, but actually lived on the land. In other words, each landowner was indissolubly tied to his inheritance, which represented his *raison d'être* and would often bear his very name. Money comes and goes, but land remains – although the times in which people believed this are long gone.³

In selling their wheat, beetroot, or wool to millers, sugar manufacturers, or weavers, landowners figured they had no reason to benefit external producers and middlemen: it made more sense for them to reserve such benefits for themselves. In such a way, very significant industries were gradually established without any credit, for the profit not only of their owners, but also of the surrounding areas, in which these gentlemen still exercised moral authority.

As what was done for the Russian soil could also have been done for its subsoil, which was just as rich, it is reasonable to imagine that, in a more distant future, both vertical and horizontal trusts would have been set up. This would have entailed the creation of what has now become the latest fashion in capitalism, yet in such a manner as not to infringe upon private landed property, genuine values, and relationships, and the dynastic stability of the holders of the strictly mutual credit, which would have been paid off within a closed circuit and covered through reciprocal personal services.

The attainment of this result would have clearly proven the superiority of the property system over the capitalist one. Only an unflattering memory would have remained of the days in which generations following the torch of Jewry believed the only choice for the human race was between Israelite capitalism and Jewish Communism.

A crisis such as the one we are currently experiencing – a paradoxical crisis of over-production – would have been quite unthinkable in a system based on landed property. In such a system, a crisis of this sort would rather have been regarded as a heavenly blessing.

In the day of Joseph, the son of Jacob and minister to the Pharaoh, seven years of good harvests were certainly not treated as an over-production crisis.

Capitalism thus disqualifies and condemns itself by formulating the astounding conclusion that over-abundance engenders misery, a conclusion matched by its assertion that credit equals wealth.

Regrettably, all this only appears to have gone to the profit of socialism, which is nothing but capitalism multiplied.

It is important to point out, therefore, that at the beginning of this century, which is even more foolish than the previous one, there was a man who had suggested a different solution and even started implementing it.

In this context, we wish to reserve a word of praise for Nicholas II. People usually compare him to Louis XVI. But if a bullet from a wretched Jew had not changed the course of history, the Tsar might rather have been compared to Louis XIII:⁴ for like the latter, he managed to find – at least on one occasion – the right man and to keep him in

power despite and against all.

Stolypin's foresight makes him a greater figure than Richelieu. By centralising France and seeking to destroy its feudal structure, the latter paved the way not only for Louis XIV's sun,⁵ but also – without realising it – for Louis XVI's guillotine. Had he had enough time, Stolypin would instead have delivered a mortal blow against the rising revolution in Russia, in such a way as to check the progress of world subversion for quite some time. He appears to have been the only man of his generation in power to have been clearly aware of the plan of Subversion.

The history of Russia in recent years thus shows that it is enough for a given human personality to appear not only for certain developments – caused by the deficiencies and foolishness of other men – to come to a clear halt, but also to turn this descending course into an ascending one. At the same time, it shows that it is enough for such a personality to disappear for the exact opposite tendencies to resume their course as if nothing had happened, thanks to the foolishness, blunders, and shortcomings of men who have reverted to their old ways.

Considering what was accomplished in Russia in the four years in which fate put the helm of the country in the hands of a man whose great genius chiefly consisted of never forgetting that two and two make four, it is easy to imagine what could have been accomplished in a quarter of a century.⁶

‘Our main goal’ – Stolypin once told a journalist – ‘is to strengthen the farming folk. In it lies the strength of the country, and we already have over 100 million farmers. Believe me, if the roots of the country grow strong and healthy, Russia's voice will resound with new intensity throughout Europe and the world. My motto is shared labour based on mutual trust. Tomorrow it will be the motto of all Russians. Give Russia ten years of peace and it will seem like a different country.’

Only four years had passed, and it already seemed like a different country. Russia's potential political enemies abroad, such as the Germans, were gnashing their teeth.

Social enemies were disintegrating, and the rift within the Social Democratic Party was growing wider and wider. The Mensheviks, the Right wing of the party, declared that they were ready to work peacefully with the government: they believed the revolution was dead and buried, and treated the Bolsheviks (the Left wing) as stubborn utopians who continued to hope in an upheaval – seeing the one of 1905 as a sort of dress rehearsal for it.

Many of the founders of the Party distanced themselves from the Bolsheviks and adopted a more conciliatory approach. Among these was Plekhanov,⁷ one of the party's pundits. Lenin, in his stubbornness, was simply treated as a maniac.

During the last congress of the party before the outbreak of the war – a meeting held in London in 1907 – the Bolsheviks only got the majority through the help of an officially Jewish organisation, the Bund for Latvian and Polish Social Democracy.⁸ Its most illustrious representative was the famous Jewess known under the pseudonym of Rosa Luxemburg,⁹ who presented herself as a German eleven years later.

The last embers of the fire of 1905 had gone out. The pacification of the country was complete, and Stolypin's speeches in the House of Lords or in any other place were invariably met with thunderous applause. There was no reason to believe that things would not continue this way and get increasingly better. This enduring progress was not the result of a combination of circumstances or of more or less subtle manoeuvres of internal or external politics: it was due to solid and permanent causes that had nothing artificial or accidental about them.

[1](#) Evola substitutes, 'for twenty-one years'.—Ed.

[2](#) Evola omits the following four paragraphs.—Ed.

[3](#) Evola omits this last sentence.—Ed.

[4](#) Cardinal Richelieu was one of Louis XIII's advisors.—Ed.

[5](#) Louis XIV (1638-1715) was the King of France when it was at the height of its power, and was known as the 'Sun King'.—Ed.

[6](#) Evola omits this paragraph.—Ed.

[7](#) Georgi Plekhanov (1856-1918) was one of the first Russian Marxists, and he opposed the Bolsheviks from 1905 onwards, feeling that their strategies did not correspond to the reality of the historical situation they were in.—Ed.

[8](#) De Poncins may be conflating two organisations here: the General Jewish Labour Bund of Lithuania, Poland, and Russia; the Latvian Social Democratic Party; and the Polish Social Democratic Party, all of which supported the Bolsheviks at the Fifth Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party in London in 1907.—Ed.

[9](#) Rosa Luxemburg (1871–1919) was a German-Jewish Communist leader and one of the founders of the Spartacus League, originally from Poland but who became a German citizen. She was executed by the Freikorps for her role in the Spartacist uprising in January 1919, during the German Revolution.—Ed.

Stolypin and the Jewish Question¹

As one might have expected, Stolypin's work came up against the hostility of Israel.

Certainly, Stolypin was not exactly fond of this race: like all well-informed Russians, he regarded Jewry as the enemy *par excellence*, the inherently hostile element behind all revolutionary attacks. Yet it is equally certain that no trace of injustice toward the Jews as such can be found in his government's policies.

At the same time, no Russian statesman, not even among the most heavy-handed ones, has ever been more hated by international Jewry than Stolypin.

To realise this, we only need to look at foreign newspapers, and especially British and American ones, which are almost invariably in the pay of Israel.

We still remember the first lines of an article that appeared in one of the leading London newspapers – an allegedly conservative one, too. From Saint Petersburg, the paper's foreign correspondent gave an account of the interview he had conducted with the Russian Prime Minister: 'Here I was, then, in the beast's den... I examined the surroundings, without noticing anything unusual about them...' ²

We might expect to find similar language in the account of a meeting with Stalin or Trotsky, or perhaps Marat, Robespierre, or Cromwell – all of whom have spilled rivers of blood. But Stolypin had hugely benefited millions of poor farmers by delivering them from an unbearable yoke. The fact that this yoke had been imposed upon them by communes rather than lords did not make it any lighter – despite what certain petty sophists like to claim.

Stolypin never shed anyone's blood, except that of sentenced and executed revolutionaries, who would have met the same fate in any civilised country, under any regime. Republican France in 1871 had treated the Communards in exactly the same manner, and yet it continued to be regarded as the birthplace of the liberal, generous, and enlightened ideas of the age.

Stolypin had been forced to dissolve the parliament twice because it had become ungovernable. This can easily be seen from the transcripts of its sessions, which were no mystery to foreign journalists. If, after these two experiences, he also changed the electoral law, this was only to avoid having to set up a third parliament, which was bound to meet the same fate as the two previous ones.

Ultimately, Stolypin did not persecute the Jews more than any other citizens of the Empire. Even if we were to believe the widespread slander according to which the so-called 'pogroms' were caused by the Tsarist police, the fact remains that no 'pogroms' ever took place in Russia under Stolypin.

But while Stolypin never persecuted the Jews as individuals, he collectively did them more harm than if he had cold-bloodedly exterminated a few tens of thousands of them. Stolypin personally did the Jews far more harm than all the ministers, governors, and

Tsarist policemen in half a century. It is easy to see how, for all species of migratory birds living everywhere and constantly on the move, and all categories of parasites living off the sweat and toil of others, Stolypin's economic system threatened to turn into a real catastrophe.

Christians tempted and demoralised by others' bad example only led this sort of easy existence at the expense of hard-working and sedentary inhabitants occasionally, as a deliberate choice. At any time they could revert to their ancestors' lifestyle. But the Jews, who had never lived in any other manner, actually considered this way of life to be perfectly normal. So when it was brought to an end, they were forced to disappear and emigrate.

Never have there been so many passport requests from people in Russia wishing to leave for the United States as under Alexander I and Alexander II, when the Tsars partitioned Poland and inherited its Jews. The government was all too glad, of course, to issue these papers. Stolypin thus greatly contributed to increasing the population of the ghettos in the big cities of the New World.

Like their ancestors in the time of Moses, the wretched Jews fled Russia, which was like a new Egypt for them, even though they were not being forced to build any pyramids under the threat of the whip. Still – and this was even worse in their eyes – they felt there was less and less room for them and their methods in Russia. Their powerful brethren, however, who fabricated consensus and issued credit (after having made people believe it was the same as wealth), did not so readily accept the idea of losing incalculable profits in the Russian Empire. It is also likely that they were alarmed by the fact that a man had shown to his contemporaries, by means of experiments, that other ways of life and modes of human interaction existed apart from capitalism and socialism.

As everything in this world is relative, it is clear that for the above-mentioned milieu, Stolypin must have embodied what Lenin and Trotsky embody in the eyes of our honest Christian contemporaries, or what Danton and Robespierre were for eighteenth-century society: a dangerous threat to the social order and to established values. Stolypin, therefore, had to be portrayed as an oppressor of the people and an obstacle to progress. This is precisely what the thousand voices of the subservient press tried to do before the assembly of spellbound nations. The conclusion was that it was necessary to get rid of Stolypin as soon as possible, before he might have the time to carry out his plan, thus setting an example for others to follow.

We can now understand why Stolypin was seen as a beast by that journalist – so upset to find himself in its lair – even though he had never devoured anyone. Likewise, we can understand why only ruins remained of this formidable monster's den a short time later, the villa in Saint Petersburg which the state used to reserve for ministers in power. A bomb thrown by Jews dressed as officials exploded one day when the head of the government was giving a hearing. A hundred or so innocent people died: the minister himself escaped unscathed, but his young children were maimed.

This happened at the beginning of Stolypin's career as a minister. An unbroken chain of

attempts on his life followed, which the police managed to thwart. Stolypin was too intelligent a man to need any *memento mori* of this sort in order to realise that, once engaged in such a battle, he could hardly hope to die a natural death.

Throughout the fruitful years in which he was in power, Stolypin was ready to be summoned by God at any moment. A good Christian determined to fulfil his duty to the very end and die as a soldier, he serenely awaited God's judgement.³

What was fatally destined to happen took place in September 1911 in Kiev, the old city which the Russians regard as the cradle of their civilisation. On the occasion of the inauguration of a monument to Alexander II, a gala event was organised which was graced by the presence of the imperial couple, the court, and the highest dignitaries of the Empire.

Seats were by invitation only, but a few had been set aside for the security agents (the Okhrana). During an interval, as the Prime Minister rested against the balustrade in the first row near the orchestra, engaged in an animated discussion with his entourage, one of the security agents in an evening dress – a man who happened to be Jewish – approached him unnoticed and fired his revolver. Just before collapsing, the fatally wounded Stolypin made the sign of the cross in the direction of the imperial box. His last thought and gesture must have gone to his sovereign.⁴

Stolypin passed away a few days later. It was not only a minister who died; from a historical perspective, it was even more than a Tsar: that Jewish bullet fatally wounded Tsarism itself and Imperial Russia. While the latter did not immediately perish after the incident, it died of the wound a few years later.

The public – the general public as well as part of the people – foresaw what irreparable misfortune awaited Russia. Europe, however, paid little attention to the episode, whose implications it failed to grasp. To this day, Europe has yet to realise that, from the point of view of the overall chain of historical causes and effects, the murder in Kiev was probably as serious an event as the assassination in Sarajevo.

It is likely that if Stolypin had lived, there would have been no war; and if war had broken out anyway, Russia would have fared a lot better in it. As for the Revolution, it probably would have been anticipated and avoided despite the war. But fate or cosmic evolution – terms synonymous with occult conspiracy – had other plans.

Stolypin's unfinished work rapidly came to a standstill after his death. The great man Russia lost had no spiritual heirs capable of continuing his task. Besides, the World War was approaching.

Yet, genuinely superior men always leave some traces.

In Stolypin's case, the trace left is a deep, if not indestructible one, since it has not yet been erased by those powers which have managed to destroy the Empire, the Tsarist dynasty, the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, tradition, and the social order of Russia under our very eyes, and even undermine its religion, without encountering any serious resistance. This trace, which represents the greatest obstacle standing in the way of Bolshevism, consists of the presence of relatively well-off individual peasant estates.

All books written and published concerning contemporary Russia talk of *kulaks*, *sredniaks*, and *biedniaks*: wealthy farmers, medium-holding farmers, and peasants with no resources (comparable to the proletarians). The establishment of the first of these classes, and to some extent the second one as well, is largely, if not entirely, due to Stolypin's work. This class includes around three million farmers who were formerly under the *mir*, the rural communes created by Alexander II. Stolypin turned these peasants and their heirs into free estate owners – *beati possidentes*.⁵

Stolypin freed them from the yoke of the *mir*, which had a socialist foretaste to it. In today's fallen Empire, these men are the last champions of the principle of property ownership, the only ones whom the revolution funded by international Jewish capitalism must really reckon with: for the only way it can convert them is by exterminating them.

This is all very revealing: it was easier to cancel centuries of history than the recent and hardly begun work of a single man who stayed in power for only four years. And if the greatest attempt at collectivisation ever witnessed by humanity will ever fail, it will mean the triumph – twenty years after his death – of the great feudal innovator whose name our contemporaries have almost forgotten.

Bolshevism has easily triumphed over living men, and yet it is this dead man – whom Jewish bullets cannot kill a second time – who represents its greatest threat.

This is the most beautiful funerary oration Nicholas II's minister could ever receive, and it is being delivered on his forgotten tomb by History itself.

We shall end this chapter by comparing the work of the two men who found themselves in the limelight at the twilight of Tsarism: Witte and Stolypin.

If we forget about Witte's ties with Jewish milieus and his secret aspirations, he and Stolypin may be said to have pursued largely the same goal: the establishment of a powerful, solid, and wealthy state – a materially advanced state in which all latent potentials would have been put to good use in peacetime so that they could be mobilised in times of war.

Stolypin did not want Russia to be an exclusively agricultural country and did not shun the prospect of industrialisation, for this would have meant embracing conservatism in the most foolish of fashions.

Both men wished to have agriculture as well as industry, although they pursued this goal by following two radically different paths.

Witte envisaged the state of the future as a vessel beaten by the waves of credit in the ocean of fluid international business transactions. He dreamed of a state fashioned after the capitalist ones of Europe and America, which keep their balance not so much through their resources as through a sort of gambling that goes on until they have nothing more to stake.

In a more original fashion, Stolypin envisaged the new state as a fortress erected on the soil and subsoil of his country, its foundations set deep in the solid ground of his

ancestors. More time was required to construct a state of this sort, but the only risk was that the building work might be interrupted before it was finished.

Witte automatically created an army of proletarians who had everything to win in the case of an upheaval. Without them, the Jews would never have found recruits for their revolution. Aware of this, Stolypin instead created an army of proletarians who were naturally and instinctively loyal to the social order and capable – as they still are – of serving as soldiers of the counter-revolution.

Witte worked for the triumph of international business: fatally, those who benefited the most from his method were the international of gold and the red international. Stolypin worked for the Tsar, for Russia, and for the Russians. Yet he did not reckon with his death and a premature World War.

Had Witte pursued his plans to the very end, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and their backers would have met few obstacles – indeed, they would still be meeting few today, fifteen years after their triumph. Had Stolypin had the time to accomplish his task, the Bolsheviks would never have found the lever they needed to stir up one-sixth of the world – their work would have been confined to isolated attacks against individuals.

[1](#) Evola entitles this chapter, ‘The Jewish Question in Russia’.—Ed.

[2](#) Evola condenses the final part of this paragraph and omits the following three paragraphs.—Ed.

[3](#) Evola omits this paragraph.—Ed.

[4](#) Evola condenses this paragraph somewhat.—Ed.

[5](#) Latin: ‘blessed are they who possess’.—Ed.

The Revolution of March 1917¹

With the disappearance of its most illustrious servant, Tsarism entered its death throes.

While Stolypin's closest collaborators, Kokovstov and Krivoshein, had proved themselves worthy ministers – the former of finance, the latter of agriculture – no man was found who could take his place and hold sway over the political parties and the court.

Apparently, Stolypin's death hadn't changed a thing. The ministers were the same, as was the Duma, the bureaucracy, and even the staff. The intention to follow in the steps of this irreplaceable man who had passed away was still formally there, and was probably sincere enough. In reality, however, as the man who had died had been the only leader of 100 million people, everything had changed.

With Stolypin's death, everything fell apart and chaos spread, starting with the Imperial court. Things were bound to continue in this way not so much until the fall of the regime – for the regime in itself meant little – but until the rise of a new leader.

Unfortunately, this leader was Lenin, whose advent signalled the end of the agony and the beginning of Hell.

Following Stolypin's murder, Nicholas II's weakness and hesitation only increased.

Finding no one to support him, the Tsar could no longer tell if it was he himself who was swaying to and fro, or the world around him.

Pulled hither and thither, the Emperor did not know which way to turn. Born on the day of Saint Job, he saw this as a fatal sign. Nor did the Tsar know whom he could trust, as even his family stood divided on many questions. So he ardently prayed to God for inspiration. Soon, the only things he trusted were oracles, spiritualists, clairvoyants, and all the self-appointed magicians and initiates who started gravitating around Tzarskoye Selo,² which the Imperial couple hardly ever left.

The Revolution was imminent.

In unison, the Jews of both hemispheres got ready to put sentenced Russia to the sword: the day was fast approaching in which the bleakest pages in the history of mankind would be written. Meanwhile, in the capital of the Tsars, people were enjoying themselves and partying like never before. Even in the provincial towns, the carnival seemed to be in full swing. No doubt, an undefinable sense of unease was in the air, even if no especially unusual events appeared to be taking place.

On 8 March 1917, the Revolution broke out, soon growing to threatening proportions.

The Revolution received support – at least moral support – from the Entente. The future members of the Provisional Government held several meetings in the office of the British ambassador, Sir George Buchanan. The Tsar complained about this to Britain, alleging that its spokesman was lending support to the enemies of the Imperial government. The British replied that there was no one who could take Sir Buchanan's place. So the man

stayed.

Other forces were working against Tsarism, starting with international Jewry. 'The Social Democratic, the Socialist Revolutionary Parties, the Polish Socialist Party, all counted Jews among their leaders. Plehve was, perhaps, right when he said that the struggle for political emancipation in Russia and the Jewish question were practically identical,' a fanatical Jewish author and partisan of the Revolution writes.³ He then adds: 'To a greater degree than ... any other ethnic group in the vast Empire of the Romanovs, they [the Jews] have been the artisans of the Revolution of 1917.'⁴

The Tsar fell. A delirious cry of joy accompanied his fall.

The verdict of the press of the Entente was unanimous. Not a voice was raised in defence of the man who had been our loyal ally – until his death.

According to Princess Paley, Lloyd George claimed: 'One of the aims of the war for Britain has been met.' The Entente enthusiastically welcomed the new state of affairs.

'France in 1793 faced the opposition, if not of all the peoples of Europe, of all its governments. Russia in 1917 has all the democracies of the world supporting and assisting her, and helping her win', Mr Vandervelde wrote⁵ – one of the men whom the Entente sent to Russia to convey the regards of the Western democracies to the Revolution.

Great was the joy for this 'bloodless' revolution.

But despite such complacent claims, blood was indeed being spilled. Soldiers started killing their officers. The navy in Helsinki, Kronstadt, and Odessa witnessed genuine butchery. Admiral Nepenin was assassinated and his body exposed to the insults of the crowd for three days. Admiral Viren, the commander of the fleet at Kronstadt, was tied to a stake and burned alive before the eyes of his daughter. In the hospitals, sick or wounded officers were finished off with the bayonet.

The Tsar signed his act of abdication between 11 PM and midnight on the night of the 15 and 16 of March 1917.

At this difficult crossroads in history, the revolutionaries did not commit the irreparable imprudence of showing their real face. Without going too far, they could have talked of establishing a republic. But had they done so, they would have risked losing the support of most of the generals: for had the latter known that by abandoning the Tsar they would also be losing Tsarism, they would never have acted as they did.

Events have shown how well the invisible agents played their role by presenting themselves as being moderate in their demands.

Gutchkov, a delegate of the Duma, arrived in Pskov, the headquarters of the northern armies and the place where Nicholas II was based, and asked the Tsar to abdicate. The latter readily handed him the signed abdication act. Then, turning to one of his aides-de-camp, Nicholas II said the following words: 'If Stolypin had still been around, none of this would have happened.'

Nicholas II was right. The only unexpected thing was the fact that the Tsar was abdicating not in favour of his son – a sickly and debilitated minor he wanted to keep by his side – but in favour of his own brother Michael, making him not just the Prince-regent, but the lawful Emperor.

Unfortunately for Russia, the weakness and levity of this Prince matched his naivety. Besides, he had no wish to rule under such dangerous circumstances.

Morgantically married against the will of the head of his family to the divorced wife of an officer of the Guard, he had been exiled and only allowed to return to Russia after war had been declared. His marriage had caused a scandal, and the Grand Duke Michael was not the man for the situation.

He himself was perfectly aware of it. Two days after the abdication of Nicholas II, representative leaders of the Duma easily persuaded him that it would be a good move on his part to postpone his accession to the throne and wait for the alleged verdict of the nation, as expressed by the future Constituent Assembly, which would have been elected through equal, direct, and universal suffrage. *Vox populi vox Dei*:⁶ no one suspected or admitted that the *vox Dei* could only have been the *vox Judei*.

His was a way of abdicating without abdicating; of hiding behind words by paying a phonetic act of courtesy to the past. Thus, in less than a week, in two stages, Tsarism ceased to exist.

Greater skill could hardly have been shown in this conjuring trick, as achieving it in only one stage would never have been possible.

In Pskov, Nicholas II had genuinely believed he was doing the right thing by abdicating in favour of his brother. Had he known exactly what he was being induced to do, he would probably have refused to sign, as he was surrounded by generals who were not all traitors to the dynasty and regime. Everything suggests that civil war would have broken out at the Tsar's refusal.

Once in Tzarskoye Selo, the Emperor learned that he had in fact abdicated in favour of the republic, the advent of which no one doubted. He also found out, among other things, that the Empress had already been interned, and that he himself was a prisoner in his own palace. The servants of the Jew had not wasted any time.

Meanwhile, the provisional committee of the Duma had given way to a Provisional Government whose nominal leader – as Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior – was Prince Lvov. As his family roots apparently stretch back to Rurik, people used to say at the time that this aristocrat's lineage was more ancient than that of the Romanovs. The possibility cannot be ruled out that Lvov ultimately planned to take advantage of the turmoil and disorder in order to establish a new dynasty. He believed that nothing had changed since Boris Godunov's day.

Prince Lvov was surrounded by people more clever than himself. In turn, they were manoeuvred by others cleverer still, through a kind of left-hand chain leading to Jews – either by blood or spirit. The latter were getting ready, at the end of this cycle, to

implement a plan strangely similar to that of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

The rhythm of these eight months of preliminary revolution may be compared to that of Isis gradually removing her veils.

We shall list the leading ‘clever’ figures who controlled Prince Lvov right from the beginning and made sure he would not abandon his ambitious illusions.

The historian Milyukov, the head of the constitutional democrats some fifty years ago, was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs. Milyukov enjoyed the friendship of an important Jewish-American financier, Jacob Schiff,⁷ who was a personal enemy of Tsarism. For this reason, the latter’s life was spared, while nonetheless he was thrown out the moment his services were no longer required.

The established myth according to which two distinct revolutions took place – a good and desirable one in March and a bad and detestable one in November – is utterly false.

The Russian Revolution occurred as a single dynamic unit. Three teams of workers – nothing but paid workers, we would like to stress – worked together for the same boss.

The first team consisted of Rodzianko, Shulgin, Nekrasov, Milyukov, Guchkov, and others. This team sowed or let others sow – which amounts to the same thing. The second one, that of Kerensky, Chernov, and all the rest, reaped, while the third, that of Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and their comrades, served the food at the master’s table.

The latter, the boss, or rather the active party in charge of the demolition and reconstruction business, did not mind showing his feelings right from the start, without waiting for the November events.

As the Minister of Foreign Affairs of a provisional state that was no longer a monarchy, but had yet to become a republic, Professor Milyukov – this old leader of the Kadets,⁸ who in the eyes of the well-off were the members of a wisely liberal and moderate party – received a telegram from New York which could essentially be compared to what a sovereign might send his general to voice his satisfaction for some important victory in battle. This telegram was signed Jacob Schiff.

Any ordinary minister in Milyukov’s position would have been extremely surprised. But the wise professor – who continues to be held in high esteem in Paris, where he is regarded as a particularly interesting victim of the Russian tragedy rather than one of its chief authors – felt most honoured. He did not answer Schiff’s message with words such as, ‘Why don’t you mind your own business? Do I ever send congratulations to you when you strike a good deal on Wall Street?’ Instead, Milyukov expressed himself in terms that suggest – at the very least – a perfect mutual understanding between the two.

This fact is so significant that it is quite amazing: for once, breaking the century-old law of anonymity, a prince of the global conspiracy dropped his reservations.

This proves just how much those people believed the game had been won by 1917, not only in Russia, but all across the world. After the defeat of Germany, the Conference of Paris, which was dominated by Jewry, made the world submit to international Jewish

finance. These people's confidence in their success was so great that they no longer even felt the need to take public opinion into account.

Thus the men of the (fortunately short-lived) revolutions in Hungary, Austria, Bavaria, and Germany were almost exclusively Jewish by race, not straw men recruited by the circumcised, or puppets in the hands of Israel. This was something quite unprecedented. As soon as they realised that it was still early to act in this manner, they reverted to their old methods.

It was the March revolution, not the one in November, received a sort of investiture from Israel, through Jacob Schiff's best wishes. Some people naively believe that events unfolded in this way because only the March revolution was desirable from a Jewish point of view, whereas the November one – in its zeal – had gone too far, creating a sort of revolution within the revolution. The truth is that, in the eyes of the initiates, the second revolution was simply the follow-up to the first one; hence, there was no need to repeat the words which had been pronounced when the first brick had been laid. The edifice will only be consecrated once it is completed, which it still isn't. Through the prompt help of Europe and America, the work goes on,⁹ although nowadays it is called a quinquennial plan.

Once the abdication of the Tsar had been followed by that of Tsarism itself, and once the first decree had been issued, ruling out what hope still remained of launching a counter-revolution, and thus signalling the final victory of the chosen race, the cataclysm hit Russia for good.

*Prikase*¹⁰ no. 1 had been conceived with diabolical craftiness, which the workers and soldiers' delegates in the Saint Petersburg area would never have been capable of on their own. This document was not modelled after any historical precedent, for nowhere had a document of this sort ever been drafted in the aftermath of a revolution.

Prikase number 1 meant the murder of the Russian army. It broke not only the latter's drive and spirit, but also its skeleton and structure, turning it into a flabby and spineless body. As a national and counter-revolutionary force, the army was finished. One force – the national one – had deliberately been sabotaged, or rather stifled, so as to avoid having to fear the other – the counter-revolutionary. To act any differently would have meant compromising, or at least jeopardising, the dynamism of the revolutionary progression, which was meant to lead to the apotheosis of the Jew and the transformation of the fallen Empire into an exotic colony for the international Jewish bank, where Jewry will forge its weapons for conquering the rest of the planet.

We wish to stress the fact that one thing was quite deliberately and consciously sacrificed for another: the minor importance of Russia as an ally of France and Britain was sacrificed to the evidently superior interest of the chosen race – otherwise, we would have to conclude that the cultivated men who had received the heritage of the Tsars were nothing but complete idiots, which of course is far from the truth.

It was not Lenin and Trotsky's work that freed Russia from the yoke of Tsarism. It was rather the work of the 'noble, generous, and enlightened spirits' who reached this goal

with the benevolent approval of the Allied ambassadors. This work was warmly applauded by the French and the British – including many so-called conservatives – not to mention the United States, which appears to have waited for these events before abandoning its neutrality and declaring war on Germany.

Prikase number 1 did not dampen this enthusiasm, which nonetheless gave way to imprecations and insults the following year, when the Brest-Litovsk treaty was signed between Germany and those carrying on the work of the ‘generous and enlightened men’ who had made this treaty inevitable by destroying the Russian army and making it completely unfit for war.

Meanwhile, a general amnesty had been proclaimed. The doors of prisons and penal colonies were opened up, so that not only political prisoners but common criminals as well swarmed to fill the streets and roads.

All the terrorists who had bloodied the Tsarist empire over the previous quarter of a century, all those who had fled to avoid the gallows, all the dregs of London, New York, Paris, and Geneva, made their way back to Russia.

They were welcomed like dauntless and spotless heroes. In some cases, the Minister of Justice himself, Kerensky, was there to welcome the glorious martyrs at the station.

Finally, the third great act of ‘progress’ was accomplished on 14 April. A decree announced a radical agrarian reform: without any compensation, all landed properties beyond a certain number of hectares were to be confiscated. This was a way of begging the entire aristocracy. Men of leisure from the bourgeoisie, however, were left alone, as were stockholders, shareholders, people living from lucrative liberal professions, peasants, and so-called *kulaks*, or wealthy farmers.

Only twenty years or so later, once everything which had come before had been swept away, did Jewry feel strong enough to attack these categories of people. For the time being, farmers – whether large or small – were treated as the animals of the revolution, not unlike the workers and the proletariat. The aim was to give all of them the impression of benefiting from the upheavals which were taking place, and of forming a united front.

The inhabitants of the ancient Empire were divided into superimposed classes. At every new stage of progress, the class above was to be suppressed with the help of all those below. The ruling dynasty had already been eliminated with the help of the landed gentry, the rich bourgeoisie, the intellectuals, and the people. It was now the turn of the aristocracy, which had to be eliminated with the help of the bourgeoisie. The rhythm of the Revolution has remained the same from day one – it has never changed.

The nobleman Lvov, the cultured bourgeois Milyukov, the revolutionary lawyer Kerensky, the terrorist Chernov, Lenin and Trotsky, Stalin, and all the rest were – and are – merely the successive executors of the same original and unbroken plan.

The writers and historians who speak of the Russian Revolution as groping in the dark until the rise of Lenin are deeply mistaken, for they are considering it from the point of view of the interests of the middle class first, then of the farmers, and finally of the

proletariat. But if they were to simply consider it from the sole point of view of international Jewry right from the start – calling for the progressive elimination of the royal dynasty, the army, the landed aristocracy, the politically active bourgeoisie, and small rural properties – they would soon realise that the Russian Revolution is a seamless and dynamic whole carefully regulated with an admirable degree of consistency; and that no process of elimination ever took place without a previous one having averted all possible threats.

Yet, while Saint Petersburg and two or three other large cities were still celebrating their day of glory with processions, parades, speeches, and debauchery, in the countryside and the rest of the Empire, the Great Evening had already come. The whole of Russia was alight with old palaces, farms, parks, and forests on fire.

The primordial instincts of the *mujiks*,¹¹ whose savage nature had only been held in check by the fear of beatings, were suddenly awakened when they learned that they no longer had any God or Master to fear; or, rather, that they themselves were now this God and Master. Indeed, they were more so than the Tsar – they were told – because whereas his authority stemmed from divine investiture, by grace of God, the self-proclaimed heirs of Tsarism claimed that their own authority derived from them.

The *mujiks* concluded that, since everything was theirs and existed through them and for them, there was nothing left for them to do but to eat, drink, beat, pillage, rob, rape, torture, burn, destroy, and kill – if for no other reason than to prove that their power was real through such unquestionable attributes of omnipotence.

An orgy unfolded in Saint Petersburg, and torrents of blood stained the vast plains of Holy Russia, while people waited for rivers of milk and honey to flow – a prospect dangled before their eyes by the accomplices of the Jew, who to this day continues to predict such things for the future.

In this period, which the virtuosi of the pen continue to describe as an idyllic one, desolation and abomination reigned in Russia months before the Bolsheviks made their proper appearance. Russia's capital has been mistaken for the whole country. In Saint Petersburg, people still spoke of liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice. The foreigners in the city felt moved, as do many Russian citizens, who still believe that if Lenin had never arrived on that sealed train, the noble and generous revolution would have brought about a sort of Kingdom of God on one corner of the Earth.

Only the outer peel of the Russian upheaval – destined to disappear as soon as it touched the Earth – could seem liberal and humanitarian. The fruit itself was socialist and the seed within the fruit Communist, yet all of these were nothing but dead matter. The living bud that was the *raison d'être* of the fruit, and was destined to emerge as its concentric layers rotted or were absorbed, was Jewish. Thus the Gospel parable of the mustard seed proves equally applicable to the counter-Church that is being built by the ape of God.

Let us now briefly examine the historical details behind this revolution.

In early May, at the peak of this idyllic period, a new riot broke out in Saint Petersburg.

Teams of workers armed by an unknown hand and supported by a regiment took on a menacing attitude. Milyukov and Guchkov, the man who had obtained an act of abdication from Nicholas II and tolerated *Prikaze* number 1 as Minister of War, resigned amid the roars of a delirious crowd shouting 'Peace!' Meanwhile, Mr Paléologue, the French ambassador, quit his place, along with all the defeated French socialists who had come to Russia to swoon before its liberating revolution.

As a consequence of all this, the Provisional Government had to be restructured. As one might have expected, this occurred by veering to the Left.

The new government was a coalition one, but the absolute majority now went to the Soviet, whose soul was Kerensky.

Within this new hybrid combination, Kerensky took the Ministry of War. He claimed he wished to raise the spirit of the army and halt the decay he himself had caused in the first place. He sought to defeat Germany not through strategy and tactics, but through dialectic and rhetoric. He also aspired to make the disintegrating divisions and brigades unstoppable through methods comparable to those Orpheus successfully used with wild beasts.

It is quite likely that Kerensky, like the Western braggarts in his party (Vanderwelde, Branting, Thomas, Henderson, and all the rest) naively dreamt of a so-called democratic white peace, to be reached by the so-called working classes of the countries at war by overthrowing the monarchical or bourgeois republican regimes in power: a peace which would bring the armed conflict to an end by common accord through a series of simultaneous strikes – the prelude to a general revolution.

Reasoning of this kind was quite logical coming from a socialist whose only goal apart from the pursuit of his personal ambition was the triumph of socialism. It was far from logical, however, from the point of view of Jewry, since for the latter, socialism was only a means, and not an end in itself. With other strings on its bow which its unwitting servants didn't need to know about, Jewry expected to pass this stage on the way to the Promised Land, or at least to turn it into a means for future conquests. Indeed, Israel was not mistaken.

It was at this point that the American sector of the world conspiracy, which had been kept aside until then, was invited to join the game.

An invitation from the Jewish consortium in New York was an order to the executive in Washington. The latter's representative, Woodrow Wilson, had no intention of being removed like his predecessor, William Taft.

No one has ever quite understood why the United States declared war on Germany. The German Empire posed no threat to either the present or future of the country. To bring about its collapse, they invested billions and sent almost two million soldiers, drafted in a hurry, over to the other side of the Atlantic.

Nothing like it had ever been seen before in the annals of this peace-loving republic.

The avowed reason for American intervention was to avenge the sinking of an English ship that had carried Americans on holiday, whom the German ambassador had actually warned not to make the crossing under the flag of the warring powers. The disproportion between cause and effect was so great that all the sentimental and bombastic phrases reeled off for the occasion could only be taken seriously by teenagers completely lacking any experience of adulthood, or by people who had been instructed not to investigate the background of these events.

It is just as difficult to explain why President Wilson, a spawn of Jewish capitalism, held back until mid-April 1917, allowing both warring parties to get their supplies from American industry. Nor is it easy to understand why it was only from this date that the whole mechanism of the transatlantic press turned violently against Germany.

Now, however, we can see where the simple answer lies: up until mid-April 1917, it was necessary to allow the German monarchy of divine right to crush the Russian one. By the date in question, this goal had been met, and hence only the big Western democracies had to be supported, so that all together they could crush the German monarchy of divine right.

Under these conditions, Russia was conveniently replaced by America, and could be left to its own destiny, which involved going beyond socialism, without thereby posing any threat to the future, in which 'the world would be safe for democracy'.

¹ Evola adds, 'American Intervention'.—Ed.

² The Imperial residence at the time, near Saint Petersburg.—Ed.

³ A S Rappoport, *Pioneers of the Russian Revolution* (London: Stanley Paul, 1918), p. 250.—Ed.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 288.—Ed.

⁵ Emile Vandervelde, *Three Aspects of the Russian Revolution* (London: G. Allen & Unwin).—Ed.

⁶ Latin: 'the voice of the people is the voice of God', a phrase which was first introduced by the Whigs in England in 1709.—Ed.

⁷ Jacob Schiff (1847-1920) was originally from Germany, but emigrated to the US and joined Kuhn, Loeb & Company in 1875, which at the time was one of the biggest investment banks in America. In 1885 he became its director. He also became the director of many other prominent American corporations, including Wells Fargo and the Union Pacific Railroad. In 1904, through Kuhn, Loeb & Co., he provided funds to the Japanese Empire which ended up totaling half of the funding the Japanese required to wage, and win, the Russo-Japanese War, which Schiff saw as retaliation for Russian anti-Semitism. While he financed loans to many nations, he refused to provide any funds for Russia until after 1917. The period between 1880 and 1920 is known as the 'Schiff era' in American Jewish history, as Schiff was the most prominent and active Jewish community leader and used his wealth to finance many Jewish causes.—Ed.

⁸ The Kadets were the members of the Constitutional Democratic Party, which favored democratic reforms and a constitutional monarchy.—Ed.

⁹ Evola has, 'Through the prompt help of a certain Europe and America, the work goes on, under different names...'—Ed.

¹⁰ *Prikase* is Russian for decree.—Ed.

¹¹ Peasants.—Ed.

From Kerensky to Lenin

The efforts made by Kerensky in Russia to bring about a democratic peace through the mutual agreement of the socialist parties of the warring nations¹ were all in vain.

One thing was clear: if Russia had continued the war to the very end, the revolution too would have continued to the very end.

What Kerensky feared was not carrying the revolution to the very end, but the prospect of counter-revolution in Russia in the event of one of the two emperors of central Europe achieving victory. He reasoned as any man of the far Left would have, which is to say as any man sincerely devoted to Jewry, although he did not know what the final verdict of the world conspiracy was going to be. Kerensky did not believe that France and Britain were facing Germany and Austria-Hungary on a national level; rather, he quite rightly – for such was the deeper meaning of the conflagration – regarded the conflict as a titanic duel between barbarian medievalism and the smiling democracy which had emerged from the French Revolution.

The autocratic Tsar had fallen from his throne because he had ignored the occult nature of the war and embraced the cause of democracy against sovereigns who, in spirit, were the last representatives of the divine right. Kerensky, a democrat and socialist, quite naturally asked himself whether the new democracy of progress of which he was – or believed to be – the founder would escape the same fate, were he to abandon the cause of his comrades, the cause of the international Left, at a time in which it was fighting for world hegemony. And of course, he also wondered whether acting that way did not mean increasing the chances of counter-revolution on all the internal fronts in Europe – something which the victory of the monarchical bloc would certainly have led to – since neither him nor anybody else, apart from the initiates, ever suspected the one ‘as strong as God’ would bring America into play in order to avert such an abomination.

Kerensky and his men loathed the idea of working for kings and of being made fools, just as Nicholas II has unknowingly worked for the triumph of democracy. The Austro-Germans did not conceal their intentions regarding those regions they already effectively controlled. Vague talk was already being made about the prospect of having an Austrian archduke or German prince as the King of Poland, and even of uniting Poland with Austria under the sceptre of the emperor. And the possibility was also being discussed of having a member of one of the German princely families as the duke of Lithuania, Ukraine, or some other neighbouring country.

Kerensky was in a very difficult situation. Signing a separate peace treaty with Germany and Austria would have meant being marginalised by the democracies, as well as throwing oneself into the arms of the previously mentioned supporters of tyranny, while allegedly being on a crusade for progress.

But had Kerensky chosen to continue the war to the very end, he would have attracted the wrath of that revolution from Hell which had led him to the top. In either case he would have been blamed for having brought about a hopeless situation.

Kerensky had first of all suppressed the notion of divine right, which, for a people without any nationalism such as the Russians, represented the only motive for obedience and loyalty. Then he had broken the army by issuing *Prikaze* number 1. Finally, he had stirred the masses up into a frenzy by promising them to redistribute the land.

Kerensky, this small, garrulous, and crafty lawyer and petty demagogue, found himself at a complete loss. Posing as a tribune, thanks to a series of unexpected circumstances, he had been turned into a dictator. Yet, much to his own disadvantage, he was even less resolute and firm than Nicholas II; and while lack of leadership qualities may be excused in an emperor, it is something quite unjustifiable in the case of a revolutionary chief. To put it briefly, Kerensky, this amazing fence-sitter, had wanted the means but now rejected the end. He was defending himself against effects of which he had been the cause. Hence, he fully deserved the challenge to him made by Lenin, whose star was on the rise: 'You no longer trust the formulas of the past and are afraid of those of the future, yet you will soon swallow the latter and they will choke you.'

But what man was this, who was speaking in such terms, and where did he come from?

It was the leader of the Bolshevik Party, which had originally been the far Left wing of Russian social democracy.

In 1914, when war was declared, the Bolshevik group had been almost completely suppressed in Russia. Lenin had then written an appeal, launched by the central committee of the group, in which he called for the immediate transformation of the national war, described as an 'imperialist' one, into a civil war.

Because of this, the Bolshevik Party clearly diverged from all other revolutionary parties on a crucial question. In none of the warring countries had a revolutionary party dared take such a resolute stance on the matter and declare war on the war without restrictions or hesitations.

The internationalism of the other internationalist groups was only relative, and open to opportunistic compromises with their mutual feelings of xenophobia. The internationalism of the Bolshevik group was instead relentless and absolute. It is for this reason that it passed the crucial test of 1914 without giving in and betraying its principles.

Those party members who did not follow the chosen line – and there were quite a few influential ones among them – were ruthlessly struck off its list. Unlike other parties, the Russian Bolshevik one aimed for quality, not quantity.

This 'line' – of which much talk has been made lately in relation to the rivalry between Stalin and Trotsky – has always been followed by the Bolsheviks, who cannot deviate from it. This group has always had an inflexible discipline, which it has maintained through continuous purges.

The Bolsheviks, therefore, made up the chosen team. The leading consortium of international business had been keeping them aside until the day in which, following the anarchic and hence destructive phase of the revolution, it would have been necessary to proceed with the construction of the new Kingdom of Israel on the ruins of what had been.

In particular, the Bolsheviks made up the offensive element – that is, the openly and proactively offensive element of the world revolution – whereas the function of the other subversive parties would appear to have been the preliminary and simultaneous disintegration from within of the chances the existing order had to defend itself.

Hence, while Bolshevism may have outdone the other parties in terms of brutality and cynicism, it was outdone by them in terms of hypocrisy and treachery. Certainly, it was very straightforward and knew exactly what it wanted: it was the hard-liner of the revolution, which it sought to pursue to the very end; and what ‘to the very end’ meant in this case was ‘to the very Jew’.

The mission of Bolshevism was not so much to undo as to redo a world which the errors or oversights of the last Tsars had already begun undoing, and whose destruction had finally been brought about by the unspeakable anarchism of the revolutionaries.

In the last years of Tsarism, Bolshevism had only played a secondary role, a role so insignificant that the police had even shown indulgence toward it, reserving their harsher treatment for those groups which were responsible for terrorist attacks.

After war was declared, the Bolshevik Party completely fell from prominence. Its five deputies in the Duma and a few other members of its central committee, including the famous Stalin, were arrested and incarcerated on a charge of high treason.

The other revolutionary sects, which were enthusiastic about the democratic war, reproached the Bolsheviks. The old Plekhanov, one of the founders of the Party, left. Driven less by the demon of Leftist solidarity than by that of nationalism, he spoke out in favour of national defence, which coincided with the crusade launched by the democracies. The two hard-liners, Lenin and the Jew Zinoviev (Apfelbaum), fled abroad. And Trotsky, while not a Bolshevik yet, also crossed the border.

Later, the Judaising press of both hemispheres depicted these poor devils, who had carried their wretchedness to the most lowly dwellings of London, Paris, and Geneva, as the devil incarnate: as men who in the footsteps of the great prophets – including Christ himself – had awaited the fated hour absorbed in deep meditations.

Actually, the only hour these criminals were waiting for was that of the opening of the Judeo-American bank tills or their equivalent on the other side of the Atlantic.

The Holy Spirit that was to descend upon the future apostles of the counter-Church and turn these small *café-habitués* into tigers was manna, in the modern form of accounts opened in credit institutes. Those who were powerful in New York soon started raining down this manna, since they believed the time had come – until further notice – to play the card of democracy and anarchy by funding the old team, which had not yet completed its work of demolition.

According to a proverb that dates back to the remotest antiquity, but which is incredibly relevant to our age, there is no fortress which a donkey loaded with gold cannot approach.

By quoting this proverb, we do not wish to suggest that Lenin and Trotsky were donkeys.

Still, that's a long way from seeing Lenin, Trotsky, and their accomplices as infernal deities, or of considering what they have said or written to be imbued with mysterious powers that have changed a whole area of the world.

While it might be a bit much to give no credit at all to these thugs for the events of 1917, it is nonetheless true that none of them was the real conqueror of Russia; nor was it people like Milyukov or Kerensky. The real conqueror of Russia was the almighty god of modern mythology, Mammon, who has Israel as its envoy. It is always he who under different pseudonyms continues to act as the absolute master of the country sixteen years on,² under different pseudonyms.³

The Bolsheviks did not lack a desire for action. They could sense the decay of the Russian Empire. But there was not much they could do, because the hunter was keeping his dogs on a leash, waiting for the right moment to let them loose.

And what letting loose meant in those circumstances was financing.

In their hovels in Geneva, London, and Paris, the Russian Bolsheviks started growing impatient and distressed at the thought that they were being outdone by the other revolutionary groups. They made a show of goodwill by taking part in the Zimmerwald and Kienthal congresses, where they openly announced their plan for immediate revolution through the boycotting of the war. On the other hand, they also printed many revolutionary papers in which they advocated the most cursory methods. But given the painful absence of those other pieces of paper which issuing institutions print and credit establishments distribute, there was a huge disproportion between the sterile agitation of the Bolsheviks, who were left to their own resources, and the results they were destined to attain only a short time later.

Many years had passed since Trotsky had been expelled from Russia – and then Austria, England, and France. At the time of the March *coup d'état*, he found himself in New York, where he had arrived in the hope of moving his god to compassion by prostrating himself before the altar of Mammon. Received by his compatriot Jacob Schiff, the great pontiff who had telegraphed his satisfaction to Milyukov, Trotsky was only given permission to return to Saint Petersburg in order to keep a close eye on the orthodoxy of the team which had freed the 'land of captivity' from the new Pharaoh.

From that day onwards, Leyba (Lev) Bronshtein, known as Leon Trotsky, became the eye and ear of the Sanhedrim⁴ of the world conspiracy. And this was a great honour for the son of one of the many seedy Jews of western Russia.

Trotsky got the message and began making his way back, in the belief that if he fulfilled his mission, cash would soon start flowing.

Here, we would like to mention a juicy detail.

The Norwegian ship that carried Trotsky and his fortune was inspected by the British authorities at Halifax, in Canada.

Lenin's future right-hand man was arrested. It was Milyukov, Russia's Minister of

Foreign Affairs, who then rushed to diplomatically approach the British ambassador in Russia, Sir George Buchanan, asking his government to release the highly undesirable Jew and allow him to continue his voyage to Saint Petersburg.

We do not know whether it might have been Jacob Schiff who ordered the ephemeral minister of the Provisional Government to act in that manner, but it would hardly be surprising. Indeed, this is the only hypothesis that can explain the boundless stupidity of the man's gesture.

Clearly, no one knows the exact nature of the meetings that took place in New York between master and servant. Still, despite the conspiracy of silence on the part of all the big media, it is impossible to ignore that it was in the name, not of the uncircumcised Lenin, but of Leon Trotsky that an account was opened in the Stockholm branch of the Warburg brothers' bank, and that it was this fortune that brought the Bolshevik Party to power. We should add that one of the Warburg brothers was Jacob Schiff's son-in-law, while another was his sister-in-law's husband; and that their Stockholm correspondent, the banker Jivotowsky, appears to have been Trotsky's father-in-law.⁵

Lenin, who was not on such excellent terms with the elite of the chosen race, did not waste any time. At a certain moment – a psychological one for him, as worries about money were keeping him awake at night – he realised that his motto 'revolution through defeat', which in principle applied to all the warring nations, could in practice most readily be applied to Russia. Under these conditions, Lenin's motto could serve as the basis for a temporary alliance between the Bolshevik Party and the German High Command, which was still too much in love with itself to fear the German army or nation.

Pleased with his idea, Lenin entrusted a Jew by the name of Fürstenberg, who was living in exile in Stockholm under the Polish pseudonym of Ganetsky, with the duty of negotiating this alliance, which was intended to bring in some funding.

In case his ambassador failed, Lenin would disown him and pass him off as an agent provocateur of the Okhrana – for all this was taking place just before the *coup d'état* of March 1917. If Fürstenberg were shot, all the worse for him: the Bolsheviks have never had any regard for human life, including that of their own comrades.

Not that principles matter to them, either. According to Lenin, who in no way tried to conceal his ingenious idea, but was rather quite boastful about it, money knows no colour. It is always well to cash it in, when it serves a good cause (for the end justifies the means), and especially when the money comes from an imperial, royal, or simply a bourgeois treasury. In fact, in such cases, it simply means taking back part of what has been stolen from the proletariat and must be paid back – provided, that is, the Jew is the one to manage it with discretionary powers. The proletariat will then continue to suffer as in the past, but will be told that this is only for its own good; if it dies of starvation, it will be informed that it is for the prosperity of future generations.

Lenin's plan worked out very well. The Germans, who found themselves in dire straits and only considered short-term gains, wholeheartedly accepted. Fürstenberg, disguised as Ganetsky, was not shot, but instead appointed trade commissioner of the people.⁶

The world thus witnessed an extraordinary event: the semi-feudal empires were the first to fund the action of the Bolshevik Party. Germany, however, was to pay a harsh price for its impious collusion in the aftermath of its defeat. The only one to benefit from all this was Lenin, at the detriment of the three monarchies of divine right. He had indeed guessed right.

The German funding was a sort of appetizer for the Bolsheviks, as they waited for the brewers of billions of international business to open their wallets.

We must insist on this point because of the enduring popularity of the disconcertingly absurd theory according to which Bolshevism is a sort of German creation. The aim pursued by the proponents of this theory is to turn people's attention away from the Jewish conspiracy of which Bolshevism is one of the effects and the most openly aggressive sector. And as this theory has the advantage of creating a misunderstanding which worsens the relations between Germany and its 1914-18 enemies, it is fervently embraced by nationalists, who in their blindness only fear the pacification of Europe and the establishment of a uniform Christian front, which is the only safe bastion against sweeping subversion in its triple aspect of democracy, capitalism, and socialism.⁷

Ultimately, what Lenin managed to snatch from the Germans – the Christians of the old regime – was saved up by the Jews. His resourcefulness attracted the benevolent attention of the New York consortium, who were soon to invest more in him, despite the fact that he was a goy, than they did in Trotsky, whose vanity devoid of idealism and constant desire to take a leading role inspired less confidence than Lenin's sincere and selfless fanaticism.

On the other hand, only the German High Command was in a position to enable this political exile's return to his native country, who had paradoxically become its ally. The March revolution had broken out in Russia, and no laws prevented the immediate return of all revolutionaries, including the most abject murderers, who were counted among the heroes and martyrs.

As soon as he received the glorious news, Lenin, who found himself in Zurich at the time, addressed some letters to his comrades, exhorting them to swiftly organise themselves toward the end of coming to power. Lenin did not conceal his impatience and anxiety at being abroad at such a crucial time.

He did not have to wait long. Without too much hesitation, the German government – perfectly realising what favour it was doing for the new Russian government, which insisted on not withdrawing from the war – agreed to allow Lenin to pass through its territory on a sealed train, as if he were a cholera bacillus, and with him many other revolutionaries, including his wife Krupskaya, Zinoviev, Radek, and Sokolnikov, the future ambassador to London. The latter three are Jews who have given themselves new names, as these people are wont to do.

And so it was that this agreeable party travelled the whole length of Germany and across Denmark and Sweden, skirting the Baltic Sea to the north, until it finally reached Finland, which was still part of the old Empire.

[1](#) Evola has, ‘...peace through widespread sabotaging on the part of the socialist parties of the warring nations...’—Ed.

[2](#) Evola has, ‘after so many years’.—Ed.

[3](#) Evola appends, ‘At an even deeper level, it is the forces of the secret front, of which each revolutionary phenomenon is but an outer manifestation.’—Ed.

[4](#) A Sanhedrim was a council that existed in every city of ancient Israel.—Ed.

[5](#) The Jew Schiff had long hated Tsarist Russia: the Warburg-Schiff-Kuhn-Loeb group had already funded the Japanese in their war against the Russian Empire. Schiff had actually been awarded a great honour for this. As for the Warburg brothers, it should be noted that already in 1912, one of them had stated that the American banking trust which he chaired had been created with ‘the possibility of a war’ in view – a possibility quite unforeseen at the time. In his memoirs, the British ambassador to America between 1912 and 1917 writes: ‘Negotiating with Schiff and Warburg is like negotiating with Germany and the United States, as President Wilson himself has told me they are the arbiters of the US Department of the Treasury and that the government obeys them. He actually quoted the proverb: he who harms Israel shall know neither peace nor rest’ (Sir C Spring Rice, *The Letters and Friendships* [London: Constable, 1929]). In the World War, the Jewish international worked perfectly. One of the Warburg brothers (Max) stayed in Germany and another (Paul) in America, while a third (Felix) acted as an intermediary between the two. This way, regardless of which of the two warring parties won, Jewish interests would be secured. And it was indeed the Warburg brothers who were chosen as ‘financial experts’ for the peace conference in Paris! Light has also been shed on the links among the aforementioned Jewish financial trust, the British Intelligence Service, and one of the heads of the latter, the Jew Ernest Cassel, one of Schiff’s partners and the main shareholder of Vickers, a shipping and military hardware trust. Some important connections within the occult front thus become clear. It should be borne in mind here that by withdrawing from its commitment to furnish Russia with weapons, Vickers purposely contributed to weakening the Russian army; and it should further be recalled that Britain refused to allow Nicholas II to board a ship, when this might have allowed him to get away with his life. (Evola)

[6](#) We should also note the important role played in these negotiations with the German government by the mysterious international Jew Parvus-Helphand, who successfully upheld the thesis in Germany of the tactical usefulness of promoting extreme forms of revolt in Russia. (Poncins)

[7](#) Evola omits this paragraph from his edition.—Ed.

Lenin

As soon as he reached Russian soil, while still on board the train that had brought him there, with workers and soldiers getting off and on at each of the endless stops which were made in those days of general disarray, Lenin began his propaganda campaign against the war and for the redistribution of land. He was intelligent enough not to overdo things in his speeches: he only discussed matters everyone could understand, and only touched upon those issues people were most concerned with. And what the *mujiks* were most immediately interested in was to leave the trenches and gain ownership of the land which was being promised them. A skilled fellow, when establishing his first contacts Lenin did not make the mistake of talking about integral rural Communism.

The news of Lenin's return to Russia had not been made public. By her own account, his wife could not understand how the news had spread. Be that as it may, Lenin's reception was a triumphal event: it became clear that the bold gentleman with slanted eyes was a leader the very moment he stepped out of an ordinary car.

In all stations and along all the railway tracks, red flags were flapping in the wind. The sailors of Kronstadt, notorious for their bloody deeds, surrounded and acclaimed the man who was destined to guide them to victory, only to have them shot later. The streets of the capital were teeming with crazed workers singing hymns suited to the occasion. In the midst of an imposing procession, the future triumphant leader and head of the Third Communist International made his grand entry into what was to be known as Leningrad, without the so-called authorities even daring to show themselves. This was all very auspicious. Lenin addressed the workers and soldiers: 'No support to the capitalists' government! Down with the imperialist war! Long live the social revolution!'

It was mid-April, and the March revolutionaries, the 'glorious heroes' who had overthrown the 'tyrant', broken the discipline of the army, promised to give all the land to the farmers as its rightful owners, and announced the establishment of a Constituent Assembly through equal and universal suffrage, were already being treated like capitalists and reactionary members of the bourgeoisie.

Lenin spent the whole day haranguing large crowds from the windows of the hotel he had requisitioned. He hammered his ideas into the virgin and malleable substance of countless brains. His words were received with enthusiasm, for the things he said must have pleased the crowds and been easy for everyone to grasp.

His eloquence was mediocre and his rhetoric far inferior to Kerensky's, but he knew just how to convey his sincere and deep beliefs to his audience. Besides, Lenin had an intuitive understanding of the plebs and their subconscious instincts, enabling him to say what they were incapable of expressing in their own words. Lenin would speak without any restrictions, hesitations, or procrastinations. His speeches, while very down to earth, possessed a sober, substantial, and implacable logic.

Without any preambles or perorations, superlatives, or exclamations, Lenin would go straight to the point, drawing all the necessary consequences without ever slipping into

contradiction. He was like one of those simple particles or chemical elements that cannot be destroyed, since they are undifferentiated, and cannot decompose, since they are not composite bodies.

Whether we like it or not, the spareness and rawness of Lenin's cynicism, free as it was of any trace of hypocrisy or human respect, had something great and terribly new to it, which cannot be found among any of the clowns of free thought and democracy.

Nor was there anything Jewish in this perfect instrument which Jewry had found and recognised for its shrewdness. Jewry knew how to make use of the unwitting Lenin to take an incredible leap forward toward the fulfilment of its age-old hope. Indeed, for better or worse, among all the reformers of humanity, Lenin was probably the one least aware of the aim he was accomplishing.

Most opportunely, Lenin had managed to make Wilhelm II and his generals work for the advancement of socialism. In all good faith, Lenin believed he could do the same with Jacob Schiff and his consortium. He believed this by virtue of his maxim that gold knows no colour, and that it is a good method of warfare to accept offers from emperors and capitalists as long as they may be used to overthrow their thrones and banks, since anything which helps do away with the impure is pure, and the end justifies the means. This time, however, Lenin was dealing with something more powerful and more evil than himself.

An internationalist to the very marrow of his bones, and one who judged others to be like him, Lenin failed to grasp how messianically nationalist the apparent internationalism of Israel really is.

A utilitarian, materialist, and atheist at the very bottom of his being, Lenin was incapable of sensing the negatively spiritual and malignantly religious aspects of so-called historical materialism in its chain of consequences.

Lenin suffered from a hypertrophy of cunning, malice, and intelligence, which took the form of a single recurrent idea: that of the class struggle for the trough, in the light of which he interpreted all the events of history and the problems of humanity. What Lenin was doing was applying Darwin and Haeckel's theories on a human level by directly transposing their hypothesis about the struggle for life as the starting point for all animal species. Humankind, as Lenin saw it, is vertically divided into two species: the exploiters, or replete, and the exploited, or disinherited. The only reason for this distinction lies in the stomach: there is no room for the spirit – and even less for divine or Satanic inspiration.

Given these conditions, Lenin regarded Jacob Schiff and his rich co-religionists as being on the same side as Nicholas II. In Lenin's eyes, this capitalist who was funding socialism against capitalism was no more evil than the sovereign who, by the grace of God, had loaned his armies to Masonic democracies in order to overthrow the monarchies of divine right.

Such was the simplistic view of this genius with blinkers over his eyes. And this is precisely what made him one of the best workers for the vine of Israel – the man destined

to render priceless services to Jewish capitalism, while firmly believing that he had consecrated his life to the emancipation of the proletariat through the application and implementation of integral socialism atop the ruins of capitalism.

Lenin's specifically materialist and Darwinist mistake was ignoring the fact that, while the human body might be a brother to the animals, the soul – of which he wanted to know nothing – is a sister to good or bad angels. Because of this, unlike in the animal kingdom and in agreement with what Scripture suggests, the spiritual element comes first. What has really been dividing the offspring of Adam ever since Cain and Abel is not the struggle for life or the class struggle, but the war between the good angels and bad who inhabit the flesh of the rich and poor alike, making no distinction between the two – a war that stretches back to the beginning of time and is bound to continue until the end of the centuries.

Lenin only believed in the beast and the offspring of the anthropoid ape. He believed in neither the devil nor the serpent of Eden, which has become the blazon of the chosen race. This is the reason why he served Israel and served it so well, while believing he was exploiting it. And it is precisely because Lenin never realised that class struggle only serves – incidentally and on specific occasions – as an inconspicuous and secular front for two religious dispensations, the prodigious fate of this man inspires more pity than hatred. His cunning with respect to the men who were his dupes is outdone by his ingenuousness with regard to the Jews,¹ whose unwitting tool he always was.

Prior to Lenin's arrival, the Mensheviks and the various other types of socialists had made up the staff of the Soviets, whose pole star had initially been Kerensky.

On the occasion of their first pan-Russian congress, known as the Soviet of Soviets, which took place in mid-April, the delegates of the Bolsheviks – who were still a minority at the time – assembled in a separate meeting to listen to the words of their leader.

Lenin read out his theses. The reaction to his words was far from positive. Plekhanov, the person who had first brought Marxism to Russia and who up until a few years earlier had been regarded as one of the most uncompromising revolutionaries, described Lenin's speech as sheer madness.

The gentrified Left which had overthrown Tsarism called Lenin a traitor in Germany's pay. The Marxist Mensheviks and revolutionary socialists treated Lenin as a lunatic, and even the Bolsheviks – according to Milyukov – felt 'the wind had been taken out of their sails.'

The leitmotiv of this first blow which was delivered by Lenin was the following: 'Peace and fraternisation with the German soldiers; the immediate distribution of all land to the farmers and of all factories to the workers; all power and all control over production to the Soviets.'

These words, which shocked intellectual cadres, went straight to the heart of the real people, whose immediate interests they perfectly expressed. And the people, who were tired of formalities and promises, replied through tumultuous demonstrations, which led to

Milyukov and Gutchkov's resignations and to the establishment of a Provisional Government which was even more Leftist than the one before it.

Compared to what Lenin was preaching, this result did not amount to much. But Lenin knew as well as anyone else that Rome had not been built in a day. And ultimately, this striking 'première', despite the uproar it caused, was a success, since it marked the beginning of a new shift to the Left.

Meanwhile, thanks to the incomprehensible intercession of the moderate and allegedly patriotic Milyukov with the British parliament, Trotsky arrived from New York and immediately joined the Bolshevik Party.

Vladimir Ilyich Ulianov, otherwise known as Lenin, the son of a Russian official, was a practical ideologue. He was bona fide. In contrast, Leyba Braunshtein, also known as Leon Trotsky, who had been born in a ghetto and was filled with the humiliated pride of his race, cared very little about Christian farmers and workers, whom he hated just as much he hated nobles and priests. Trotsky was aware of the exclusively Jewish purposes of socialism. This was to turn humanity into a single, impersonal corporation with equal shares;² this society would have found its capital throughout planet Earth as a whole, exploiting the labour of all creatures. Israel, possibly along with a few straw men at first, would have made up the dictatorial administration council of the new society.

The third point in the plan, known to initiates alone, escaped Lenin for the psychological reasons we have previously illustrated. It was the only thing that distinguished him from Trotsky. Yet, this did not prevent him from operating in favour of the implementation of this plan with conviction and zeal, in the genuine belief that he was building the future dictatorship of the proletariat over the ruins of a capitalist society, which the Jews did not completely control and hence regarded as only a lesser form of human progress.

Lenin considered the religious question to be merely something accessory within the framework of the materialist struggle between undernourished apes and well-fed ones. The very opposite was true for Trotsky, the son of the Promise, despite his superficial agnosticism: socialism he simply perceived as the harbinger of Judaism. But in practical terms this was of no importance, since the plan had been drawn up in such a way that the two goals were indistinguishable.

Lenin was the incorruptible ascetic of pure idealism. Because of his faith, which spoke to the long-repressed instincts of the masses through genuine sympathy, he was completely disinterested in both his own person and his race. As a fighter he was therefore superior to the ambitious Israelite, who was probably more concerned about his personal exaltation, while basking in the messianic glory of his people.

These two men were destined to complement each other, and it is most likely that in the mind of the New York consortium they were to keep an eye on each another as well, to make sure they would not stray – one through his ingenuousness and the other through his vanity – from the shortest path toward the triumph of Israel, or at least the next stage in its Exodus throughout the ages.

Just as Trotsky was making his way from the west on board an ocean liner, rushing to join Lenin at the head of the march of progress, another collaborator – one called to a higher destiny – ended his exile in Siberia, where he had patiently been waiting for the revolution to devour its first children, and headed for the capital.

We are talking here about the Georgian Jugashvili, who was already known under various names as a terrorist, including that of Stalin, which went down in history. In Russian, ‘Stalin’ means ‘man of steel’, just as ‘Lenin’ means ‘man of the Lena’ – this being the big Siberian river near the penal colony where the founder of Bolshevism had spent some years.

Stalin took up residence in a small and very modest dwelling in Saint Petersburg, together with his close friends Skriabin, otherwise known as Molotov, a former student of the polytechnic who had become Stalin’s assistant, and Dzerzhinsky, who was a genuine Pole and who was destined to become the chief of the terrible Special Commission, better known as the Cheka.

By May 1917, the high command for the next stage of progress was thus complete: a Russian, Lenin; a Caucasian, Stalin; and a Pole, Dzerzhinsky; all the others were Jews, starting with Trotsky, Sverdlov, Zinoviev, Kamenev (Trotsky’s brother-in-law), and Radek (whose real name is Sobelsohn). They represented the extreme wing of the Revolution in the provisional council of the Russian Republic. This was a temporary institution between the Duma, which had been pirated and then buried, and the future Constituent Assembly, which had yet to be established. The Bolshevik Party only had sixty seats out of six hundred, which were occupied by various socialist groups and a certain number of ‘bourgeois’ ones – mostly fence-sitters.

Still, despite their political weakness, the Bolsheviks gradually gained control of the streets. The inner circle of the Party, committed to action, was always vigilant. The German High Command, who by now regarded the Russian army as a negligible force, halted its funding. Through the banks in Stockholm, however, American gold soon started flowing into the Bolshevik coffers.

Not a stir came from the government. Its members were caught in hair-splitting discussions to decide whether the death penalty was compatible with the sacred principles of democracy. The orators who shared the stage engaged in rhetorical challenges of an almost scholastic nature.

Exactly the same symptoms as those which had already been witnessed during the French Revolution manifested themselves in Russia. In France, in August 1789, the National Assembly, which consisted of relatively moderate revolutionaries, was passing laws on regarding the ‘Rights of Man and of the Citizen’. The Keeper of the Seals,³ reinforcing a claim previously made by Necker, had then raised a cry of alarm during one of the sessions: ‘Properties are being violated in the provinces. Arsonists are ravaging the homes of citizens. The proper forms of justice are being ignored and replaced by assaults; proscriptions and licentious behaviour are given free rein; the laws are not in force, the courts are closed, and trade and industry have come to a halt. And it is not poverty alone

which is leading to all these troubles: the greatest cause of all ills is the complete subversion of the police and all regular authorities.'

A century and a quarter later, the same causes in Russia led to the same effects. In Russia, just as in France, the usurpers perished by the sword of usurpation.

The success met by the ideas of Trotsky and Stalin led the Bolsheviks to wonder whether the moment had come for them to seize power by force, since no one at the time really seemed to be in charge. Lenin, however, the Fabius Cunctator⁴ of the Russian Revolution, a strategist of social upheaval who spent his nights reading the works of Clausewitz no less than those of Marx, believed – or so it seems – that the time was not yet ripe for action and that it was better to wait, particularly as time was working in their favour.

If what people say about Lenin's opposition is true, the 'old man', as he was called by his comrades, was quite right. It was not at all necessary to climb the tree, and risk falling from it, to pick fruits which would soon be falling anyway.

It is claimed that an appeal inviting the masses to overthrow the Provisional Government, and which was supposed to be issued through the official paper of the Party, *Pravda* (Truth), was withdrawn at the very last moment. Rumours of this plan, however, had already spread, and were enough for the sailors of Kronstadt, the *enfants terribles* of the Bolshevik sect, to show up in Saint Petersburg in armoured vehicles crammed with machine-guns.

In the month of July, for two days, what echoed through the streets of the capital were not the chants of parades and banner-filled processions crowned by the usual public speeches, but rather the sound of rifle shots. Machine-guns crackled as well. Bullets killed several bystanders and onlookers who had dared gaze out of their windows just to see what was happening. This time, a few cavalry regiments assembled in a rush were not enough to scatter the rioters.

The Bolsheviks later claimed they had simply organised a large demonstration, and that this had been enough to scare the government. The incidents that had regrettably occurred had thus been due to an act of provocation by the government.

It is extremely difficult to know the real truth about the matter.

As we personally witnessed during those days in July, we believe – but are far from categorically stating – that what occurred was a real, but failed attempt at insurrection.

Lenin and the Jew Zinoviev were forced to flee to Finland in disguise. Perhaps to remind him of the good old days of Tsarism, Trotsky was arrested and imprisoned in the Peter and Paul Fortress. Many other sensational arrests were made.

No doubt as a precaution, Lenin and Zinoviev only showed up in Saint Petersburg again in October. Most of the arrested revolutionaries, however, were soon released by order of the Provisional Government, which clearly found it difficult to accept that it could have any enemies on the Left.

Still, people could hardly believe it when they found out that Kerensky himself, the

actual leader of the regime, had gone out of his way to apologise to one of those who had been caught in the act, and to personally free him from the police station.

The person in question was an Israelite called Nakhamkes, who operated under the Russian pseudonym of Steklov, the 'man of glass'.

The behaviour of the real, if only nominal, head of state seemed bizarre, to say the least – if for no other reason than because the government at the time appeared to have passed the challenge as the undisputed and confident victor, and so could have been expected to deal with Bolshevism once and for all, and to re-establish order.

To attain this result, it would have been necessary for the government to rely on the force which had already saved it, namely the army – the antidote to all revolutions. The army showed at least some degree of loyalty toward the government, although it is difficult to say whether this was inspired by attachment to the established order, or rather the fear of things worsening even further.

A large portion of the army, however, was, if not literally Bolshevised, at least profoundly demoralised and anarchical. So it would be more exact to say that the government could have relied on some cavalry regiments, particularly the Cossacks. These formed a sort of autonomous militia based in a specific area, and were less open than the old serfs to any fanciful prospects of agrarian reform.

For many generations, these Cossack regiments had been the Jews' nightmare and the terror of all subversive movements. A government which emerged from the triumph of subversion, under the auspices of the chosen race, was bound to harbour inborn feelings of mistrust or even repulsion toward the Cossacks, feelings someone like Kerensky could not overcome. Besides, even if there were no other means of salvation apart from these methods which were hardly in keeping with democratic orthodoxy, it is likely that Kerensky could not have adopted them without betraying himself.

Under the protection of the Cossack *nahaiki* (special whips), Kerensky felt no safer than a mouse protected by a cat or the devil hiding in holy water. But it is certainly ironic that this demagogue had no other way of remaining in power for a few weeks more than to resort to the guard dogs of the old regime!

The Bolsheviks may have been defeated in reality, but they were the moral winners. The circumstances of their defeat revealed the distress of the Provisional Government, which needed to throw itself from the arms of the Bolsheviks into those of the Cossacks in order to endure. And while in the former case it would have been completely strangled by the revolution, in the latter it would have been strangled by the armed reaction of a symbolic *knout*,⁵ which would never have stopped halfway. Faced with these alternatives, the small 'garrulous and cowardly' lawyer – to quote Lenin – 'followed the virtue which appealed to him the most': democracy. Practically speaking, this meant he chose an utterly acrobatic balance, a condition impossible to keep up for long.

In the aftermath of his Pyrrhic victory, this winner, who was in a far more difficult position than the defeated, began by dismissing his saviours, whom he was terribly scared

of, without even thanking them for having risked their own lives and lost several horses, which they had paid for with their own money and which according to custom ought to have been replaced for them. This militia was bound to bear a grudge against Kerensky, who had harmed them whenever he had the chance to do so.

Immediately afterwards, Kerensky set out to get rid of some of his colleagues, and especially Prince Lvov, who was certainly out of place in that milieu. The pretext he invoked was the need to create strong democratic compactness.

What compactness meant here was the fact that democracy had to be concentrated in the hands of Kerensky as Prime Minister, Minister of War and of the Navy, and in fact minister of just about everything, not to mention *generalissimo* of the troops at war.

The '*generalissimo*' Kerensky, while highly confident of his rhetorical skills, realised he needed a sword. He believed he had found it in General Kornilov, the son of a simple Cossack soldier and a man who had won his ranks on the battlefield during the Russo-Japanese War, and on the Austrian front during the Great War.

General Kornilov was the perfect exemplar of a rough soldier. Incapable of any pretence, with no diplomacy at all, he was harsh and even brutal, but also brave and just. Kornilov was loved by his men for his uprightness and frankness.

Kornilov's democratic affinities had already been sufficiently examined, since in the aftermath of the March *coup d'état* he had been appointed as the military governor of Saint Petersburg. In these crucial hours, such an appointment was a sign of great trust. It was Kornilov who had been charged with notifying the Empress of the fall of the Tsarist dynasty and who had put her under arrest in her palace at Tsarskoye Selo, which the Emperor had not returned to after his abdication.

With this sensational act of loyalty towards the new regime – an act Kornilov only agreed to carry out once he had been assured that the two legitimate heirs had renounced the throne, otherwise he would have broken his oath to the Tsar – the General had severed all ties with the legitimist reaction, which was now bound to regard him as a traitor. Once he had irreparably compromised himself, Kornilov could no longer reasonably aspire to monarchic restoration.

Under these conditions, General Kornilov served as the sword which democracy and the republic were dreaming of – to the extent, at any rate, that they could dream of a sword. Harsh necessity forced them to temporarily depart from the 'immortal principles'; and as the one in question was no tin sword, and the person bearing it a man of war, it represented exactly what was needed to make up for what the '*generalissimo*' Kerensky was lacking.

Nevertheless, on this occasion the psychological skills of the garrulous lawyer once again failed. The man of stage battles and that of real ones had nothing in common. Kerensky had not reckoned with the fact that a soldier by vocation, and the descendent of a long line of professional warriors, even when contemptuous of privileges of birth and wealth and of imperial favours, was bound to condemn the demagogic methods which *Prikaze* number 1

had introduced into the army.

This document, which Jewish malice had inspired democracy to adopt in its madness as a way of averting the threat of a reactionary conspiracy by the officers, had managed to exasperate even those among them who had initially welcomed Nicholas II's abdication. Indeed, everyone realised that it was impossible to lead an army to victory when it was being governed by parliaments elected through equal and universal suffrage, and its leaders were little more than representatives.

Sure enough, only a short time later, the Austro-Germans, who had received some reinforcements on the western front, inflicted a disaster in Ternopil upon what had once been the Russian army.

For Wilhelm II, this Russian defeat was only a fleeting triumph and consolation, but for Lenin and Trotsky it meant a great victory. Their idea of immediate peace and international proletarian fraternisation gained much ground; and realising this, they chose to make the most of it.

Caught more than ever between the hammer of reaction and the anvil of radical revolution, Kerensky turned to Kornilov as a providential figure.

As the person directly responsible for the army's disorder, which had in turn inevitably led to the bloody defeat at Ternopil, Kerensky took the chance to summon General Brussilov, a former officer of an aristocratic regiment of the Imperial Guard. It was on this occasion that, by parodying Nicholas II's gesture, Kerensky proclaimed himself *generalissimo*, with Kornilov as his first lieutenant. And then the inevitable occurred.

The plebeian Kornilov, just like the 'former' Brussilov, did not feel he could win or even continue the war with sovietised troops and an army in which those whose task it was to obey were called to control those whose duty it was to give orders.

When it comes to the real facts of life, no democratic principles hold. A choice had to be made, and there were only two options. The first was to make peace with the central empires; and as neutrality was practically out of the question, this would have meant siding with them in the World War, where divine right faced off against alleged popular sovereignty. This would have been a paradoxical approach for the socialists, who were supported by the Left in both hemispheres.

The second solution was to continue the war after re-establishing and reinforcing military discipline and the soldiers' respect for hierarchy by reinstating the death penalty and martial law, and of course suppressing decree number 1. But for Kerensky and his fellows, this would have meant making a break with those agents who had brought them to power and were keeping them there.

The wretched and self-loving dictator had imagined that General Kornilov would prove a docile subject, easy to manipulate. Instead, aware of the enormous responsibility he bore towards Russia and confident on account of the unquestionable services he had rendered to the blooming revolution, as soon as he had reached the headquarters and taken stock of the situation at hand, Kornilov showed himself to be even more categorical than his

predecessor.

With the rather brutal frankness of a soldier from the people, and with a military-like brevity which left little room for dialectical subtleties, Kornilov – as one might say – did not mince words. And this way of acting was not at all to Kerensky's liking or in keeping with his style.

To win some time, Kerensky tried negotiating. He beat around the bush as he was wont to do, and dodged issues, vaguely promising the reinstatement of the death penalty and a few other partial measures. But the discussion dragged on, and the communication between these two utterly different men was far from pleasant. The rough soldier who had arrested the Empress because – as he put it – he cared more about Russia, finally lost his temper and gave Kerensky an ultimatum, asking for the immediate abolishment of all the changes that had been made in the military since Nicholas II's abdication.

This time, Kerensky no longer hesitated. Clearly, it was a matter of *non possumus*⁶ for the counter-Church. Realising the threat being posed to the achievements of Jewry and the Revolution, Kerensky switched from softness to harshness: dismissing Kornilov, he ordered him to immediately come to Saint Petersburg. Kerensky had forgotten that the General he was dealing with was not a sycophant he could impress with some official thundering, but a hard-boiled man who had made his career through the blows of his sword in a regime based on favouritism. Refusing to obey, the furious General marched what he regarded as his loyal troops on Saint Petersburg.

For a moment, the shiver of counter-revolution passed through the capital. Right-thinking milieus, forgetting the way in which Kornilov had behaved towards the imperial family, drew a sigh of relief and turned to him as a possible saviour. But this moment was short-lived.

Kornilov and his lieutenants, the brave generals Krimov and Krasnov, could not clean the Augean stables⁷ of the dung of the Revolution, for on this dung the seeds cast by Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and their accomplices had already produced a rich harvest of poisonous weeds. The generals had not taken account of the sovietisation of the troops and its effects.

Warned of the impending danger and struck by the joy shown by honest men, Kerensky mustered a desperate cry towards all those who were moving about or slumbering on the Left side of the line that cuts across the hearts of men – those whose bodies, according to the Gospel, will attract eagles or vultures. His call was answered by the temporary losers of the July days: the Soviet of workers' representatives and the military Soviet of Saint Petersburg, created and led by Trotsky, along with the gangs recruited from among the dregs of the people and armed by Stalin with weapons from the state arsenal.

In the face of this sudden offensive, those who, up until the previous day – when they thought they had vanquished their common enemy for good – had been talking about slitting one another's throats, immediately made friends. They remembered that, despite their bloody family quarrels, they were all sons of the same counter-Church.

The herd of the world conspiracy, apparently divided and heterogeneous, closed ranks.

In those September days, Kerensky and Lenin, the March revolution, and the future November one, formed a single, uniform bloc. In acting thus, they were refuting future historians' claim that they represented two mutually contradictory and opposite revolutions, as well as the suggestion that democracy can serve as an antidote to Bolshevism.

For Kerensky, there were no more enemies on the Left. The voice of the blood had spoken.⁸ A hundred thousand rifles and machine-guns came to Kerensky's defence, since he had become the sacred war banner of the whole Revolution.

Kerensky, by contrast, saw nothing but enemies on the Right, starting with those who had saved him from the Bolshevik ambush in July.

One last time, Providence was offering Kerensky and his partisans – many of whom were destined to die in penal colonies or be tortured to death like common great dukes or simple feudal lords – the chance to save themselves and save Russia from the final cataclysm. But clearly these men must have been bound by some mysterious oath or terrible commitment, for whereas in the past they had always dodged issues and beaten around the bush, they did not waste a single moment when faced with this higher interest or categorical imperative of their demonic conscience.

They declared the military leaders who had openly rebelled to be outlaws. This included General Kaledin, the *ataman*, or highest chief of the Cossacks, who on no clear grounds was suspected of being in league with the rebels. It was Kerensky's way of taking revenge for the insult the Cossack regiments had perpetrated against him by saving him from the Bolsheviks.

From that moment onwards, the situation was no longer paradoxical. Brothers more advanced on the path to the Promised Land of the chosen people saved Kerensky from the infamy to be crushed'.⁹

The Bolsheviks then realised that they were the only real force of the Revolution, since the person who had allegedly defeated them in July now owed them his new victory over the former allies who had helped him achieve the previous one.

Besides, the latest victory did not cost the hundred thousand thugs mobilised by the Bolsheviks in St Petersburg a single bullet to help the threatened revolutionary avant-garde. Revolutionary groups and cells had done their job among Kornilov's troops. They had explained to all those stunned illiterates that they were being marched off to overthrow a government which was bent on ending the war and giving everyone the land of the rich. These words soon produced the desired effects.

Along the paths leading to the capital, under the heat produced by the revolutionary fire, the troops melted like wax without engaging in a single battle. Kornilov was forced to flee, while many of his lieutenants blew their brains out.

Kerensky, who had triumphed over the absolute revolution in July with the help of the relative reaction, now triumphed over the relative reaction only thanks to the support of the absolute revolution.

Stalin wrote to Lenin, who was still living in refuge in Finland at the time: ‘We are virtually the masters. Day after day, we are gaining an increasing consensus among the masses of soldiers and workers. We have one thousand rifles at our disposal and this is more than enough to put the Provisional Government to flight, which only has its women’s battalions to oppose us. You can confidently return to our head: I cannot see who could be as foolhardy as to order your arrest.’

Such was the assessment made of Kerensky’s second victory. It signalled the beginning of the death throes of the semi-Jewish or Judeo-democratic regime of transition between that of the Tsar and the one hundred percent Israelite one. And if these death throes lasted about two months, it is only because Lenin was still mistrustful.

Lenin did not allow himself to be hypnotised by events in Russia. He very carefully scanned the European horizon, where men who were party to the secrets of government chancelleries – if not those of the gods – could already catch the signs of a peace without winners or losers.

Several months had passed since Emperor Karl had taken the place of his great-uncle Franz Joseph on the throne of Austria. He had entrusted his brother-in-law, Prince Sixtus of Bourbon-Parma, with unofficially negotiating with the French government.

It was later found out, through sensational revelations, that Wilhelm II had also envisaged this possibility, and that his advisers had agreed with his view – except for a few pan-Germanists who had learned nothing from historical events.

Had it not been for the ill will of those who pursued the triumph of capitalist Judeo-democracy and the abolition of the last vestiges of feudalism at the expense of the good of their own countries and of the whole of humanity, the mutual extermination would have ended much sooner, and an honourable peace, advantageous for both sides, would have been signed.

But a very different outcome was being sought, even if this was to cost hundreds of thousands of women and children the lives of their husbands and fathers.

The infamy had to be crushed. And the infamy was not Wilhelm II, although he had violated the neutrality of Belgium, his troops had committed a number of reprehensible acts,¹⁰ and his submarines had torpedoed ocean liners.

The infamy was rather what Wilhelm II stood for, and even more than him the harmless and innocent, but Catholic, Karl of Austria. Indeed, both were sovereigns by divine right: under their sceptre they brought together the traditional nobility attached to its landed estates. And this nobility, despite all, still maintained its position, both in terms of rank and in the political, economic, and social domains.

This is what had to be done away with. Everything has been sacrificed to this madness, which all peoples, with the sole exception of the chosen one, are now digesting, at the risk of losing their lives because of its toxic effects. This madness represented the undisclosed and long premeditated aim of the World War and the reason for the unprecedented release of hatred that came with it, and which was constantly fed by propaganda funded for that

specific purpose. This is the reason why any kind of peace which would not have achieved this goal, no matter how acceptable to the two warring parties, was angrily dismissed as a defeatist and premature solution: for it might have served as the basis for real European pacification and the establishment of a united Christian front against the one common enemy.

Still, a moment came in 1917 when, faced with the enormity and uselessness of the sacrifices that were taking place every day, many European heads of state – slightly less Judaised than their colleagues – awoke. A ray of hope flashed across the stormy sky.

In the chancelleries – clearly, within closed doors – talk was heard of this allegedly defeatist and premature peace. But there was no danger of the priests of Mammon and the pontiffs of Zion allowing this peace to be signed, as it would indeed have been premature, since the infamous medievalism had not yet been crushed, and Europe had not yet been politically, economically, and socially subverted.¹¹

The letter sent by the Emperor of Austria had no effect, the intervention of the Catholic King Alphonse XIII and of Pope Benedict XV fruitless, and the good will of several French ministers perfectly useless.

Kings, emperors, and popes have no power nowadays; likewise, the heads of democratic governments, parliaments, and even electoral bodies have no influence over global developments. Proof of this is the fact that, for another fifteen months, men of all races continued to butcher one another for the sole profit and glory of that small people which is in constant exodus across time and space towards a prestigious future. And this future, which its prophets have been heralding for the last twenty-five centuries or so, now seems to be taking shape before our very eyes.

The plan of subversion had to be carried out to the very end, for this was the real occult meaning of the expression ‘to the very end’ as opposed to ‘defeatism’. Otherwise, it would be difficult to understand why a peace advantageous for France, Britain, and Italy, as well as Germany and Austria, which would have been signed before the collapse of the last two countries, should have been described as defeatist.

It was essential for Germany to fall so that it could then be forcibly converted to democracy.¹²

If the ‘noble, generous, liberal, tolerant, and enlightened spirits’ in 1917 were unwilling to accept any peace with Germany unless the country was exhausted and ‘on its knees’, this was because they knew it would only ‘convert’ once crushed.

By October of the same year, all hope of a general peace had been lost in Europe. From then onwards the Russian government had only two options: a separate peace, or war to the bitter end.

Lenin’s triumph was a matter of days, or weeks at most.

¹ For ‘the Jews’, Evola substitutes ‘the occult forces’.—Ed.

2 Evola omits the preceding phrase from his edition.—Ed.

3 The Keeper of the Seals, later known as the Minister of Justice, was Charles Louis François de Paule de Barentin at the time.—Ed.

4 Fabius Maximus (280-203 BC) was a Roman general who fought in the Second Punic War, who was given the title of Cunctator, or ‘delayer’, due to his use of guerilla tactics to fight against the forces of Hannibal, who had superior numbers in comparison to the Roman army.—Ed.

5 A whip.—Ed.

6 Latin: ‘we cannot’, which refers to a story in which the Roman Emperor Dioceltian forbade the early Christians from having a copy of the Scriptures or from meeting on Sunday, which led to the famous reply, leading to their martyrdom.—Ed.

7 This refers to one of the labours of Hercules, who was challenged to clean up the stables of King Augeas, who owned a large number of cattle, in a single day, a feat he managed to accomplish by digging trenches to two nearby rivers and flooding the stables.—Ed.

8 The same was later the case with the establishment of the so-called ‘popular fronts’, which bridged the apparent gap between the two internationals. (Evola)

9 This comes from an epigram by Voltaire, who stated that religion and superstition were an ‘infamy to be crushed’, claiming it as his watchword.—Ed.

10 Evola omits the previous phrase from his edition.—Ed.

11 In the Jewish magazine *Der Jude* (January 1919, p. 450) we read: ‘The fall of these three power (Tsarist Russia, monarchical Germany, and Catholic Austria) in their ancient forms would mean *crucially facilitating the directives of Jewish politics.*’ The famous Jewish ‘writer’ Emil Ludwig (in *Weltbühne*, no. 33, 1931) adds: ‘The World War was waged to impose modern political forms upon central Europe, of the sort in force in all surrounding countries (i.e., liberal-democratic governments)... We only made it by a hair’s breadth: the partisans of a separate peace *might have saved both the Tsar and the Kaiser, preserving a Europe unbearable to us.*’ (Evola)

12 Evola adds, ‘as a prelude to Marxism’.—Ed.

The *Coup d'Etat* of November 1917: The Triumph of Bolshevism

In the early days of October, the ultra-revolutionary movement grew throughout Russia. The countless city Soviets which up until then had been dominated by the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries – the two groups which favoured Kerensky and Chernov – soon turned Bolshevik. And the Soviet in Saint Petersburg, which was the most important one of all, elected Trotsky as its president.

The municipal elections proved to be a real disaster for the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries. In Moscow, three hundred and fifty Bolshevik councillors were elected – making up about half of the assembly – and only two hundred Kadets, and just over a hundred Social Revolutionaries.

Spurred by Bolshevik agitators, many Russian soldiers fraternised with the Germans, who in turn were encouraged to behave in the same way by the Austro-German High Command. The latter believed this was contributing to the moral disarmament of what remained of the Russian army, whereas the Bolsheviks' aim was to contaminate the Imperial German and Austrian army, so that the emperors by divine right would aid the cause of the international revolution, ever confident that what was happening to their neighbours could never happen to them.

The Bolshevik Party wasted no more time. Since it had been driven out of the Kschessinska Hotel in July, it requisitioned an institute for young aristocratic ladies, the Smolny Institute, which it turned into its headquarters. The party had four printing presses, which issued half a dozen newspapers and hundreds of thousands of pamphlets and leaflets. The insurrection and *coup d'etat* were not simply approaching: they were announced as imminent.¹

As Stalin had written to Lenin, Kerensky only had a few female battalions at his disposal, comprised of women who had put on a uniform in a bout of patriotic exaltation and learned how to handle firearms.

We might correct Stalin by pointing out that Kerensky could rely not only on these women, but also on the cadres of the military school of Saint Petersburg. A few hundred women and teenagers! What wonderful support for this abject regime, which, even more than that of Nicholas II at its eleventh hour, had managed to alienate everyone from its cause. How applicable are the Gospel words to it: 'Since you are lukewarm and neither hot nor cold, I am going to spit you out of my mouth.'

There was nothing left for the Provisional Government and its no less provisional leader to do than to die as they had lived: the former by debating questions of democratic orthodoxy; the latter by holding speeches. And it should be mentioned that this gloomy perspective did not prevent Kerensky from drinking from the cup of life while lounging about in the luxury of the Winter Palace, which he had made his residence, and treating the ballet company of the Opera as his personal harem.

At the same time, Kerensky fidgeted like a devil in holy water and generously cast the pearls of his rhetorical treasure about in an attempt to create a homogeneous coalition within the Provisional Committee of the Russian Republic, which was still serving as an interim body for the parliament. Despite his efforts, all he got from this heterogeneous and anarchical assembly were five utterly different agendas. A probably unprecedented event in parliamentary history was the fact that while the matters at stake were all crucial ones, such as whether to continue the war or not, no majority consensus was ever reached. The previous eight months had witnessed an endless succession of revolutionary ministers – only Kerensky seemed to always keep his place. These men had been invoking the Constituent Assembly as a means of salvation, yet appeared to be in no hurry to convoke it.

This, of course, was not such a bad thing in itself, since a collection of unbridled rustic appetites could hardly lead to anything good. Still, there was something very unusual in the fact that no one felt the urge to convoke the Assembly among the people who swore by it. And while the Bolsheviks were no fans of Western-style parliamentary institutions, it was easy for them to take advantage of the situation and portray the victors of March as an oligarchy shamefully presenting itself under the guise of democracy, but which was actually sold out to financial power: an oligarchy that was putting off the convocation of representatives of the sovereign people out of fear that they might ask for the immediate settlement of the capitalist war and the distribution of land to those who would farm it with their own hands.

Those who had benefited from the March revolution failed to understand – or refused to believe – that the cause of what was happening was the desire of farmers to individually own land, of workers to collectively own their factories, and of all people to end the war and have peace.

This is the sheer truth of the matter; the idea that the Russian nation was instead dreaming of liberal institutions, alleged political liberties, and forms of civic equality is nothing but fiction.

The *mujiks* in uniforms were quite ready to stand at attention before those who had a right to this honour, just as in civil life they would lower their hats before lords, lords' retainers, and state officials.

For centuries the *mujiks* had been accustomed to obeying people of a higher social rank. For generations they had been accustomed to being ill-treated, and indeed of paying their respects the more they were ill-treated. This all seemed quite natural to them – a matter of order established in times immemorial by divine Providence as a way of regulating social relations.

What had passed the limits of their endurance was the fact of being exterminated by the thousands without knowing why – or for whom, after the fall of the Tsar – and without even being able to defend themselves, most of the time because of a lack of ammunition. At least they could fight back as they awaited their deaths.

The Russian farmers rose up against the war and its contingencies: against the butchery

which was reaching colossal and unprecedented proportions and had been going on for three long years. The farmers were not rising up against discipline in itself; or, rather, their revolt against discipline was merely a consequence of their revolt against the war.

Until then they had been told that it was one's duty to sacrifice oneself for the Tsar, God's regent. And they had agreed to do so, although they were growing less and less convinced by the day.

Then all of a sudden people had started telling them that it was for the collective Tsar, which is to say for themselves, that they had to litter faraway lands with their own dead bodies: that they had to continue enduring this martyrdom for the love of their country!² It was like telling these men they had to fight and die for the love of Minerva and Juno!

Such august and abstract myths were incomprehensible to them. The farmers got the clear impression they were being mocked even more insolently than in the past.

While continuing to ignore what the *mujiks* feared and wanted, thoughts, desires, feelings, ambitions, and forms of susceptibility were attributed to them whose meaning they themselves did not understand.

Soldiers were given the right to forsake discipline and the shocking privilege to collectively command those whom they had to obey as individuals, when all they were asking for was the right to peace, safety, health, and life.

Farmers were given the right to govern their communities, districts, and provinces, and indeed Russia itself through deputies they were meant to elect. And yet, they continued to be denied that small plot of arable land each of them wanted, so that he could cultivate it without meddling in his neighbours' business.

For the *mujiks*, Kerensky and his fellows were like those priests who promised them each Sunday that they would enjoy their Heavenly Father's inheritance in the hereafter, provided they accepted their misery in this life.

Switching from talk to action, Lenin announced he would convene his own parliament, the Pan-Russian Congress of Soviets. The sixty Bolsheviks who made up a weak minority in the Provisional Committee of the Republic noisily left the Assembly.

With this resolution, the Bolsheviks severed their ties with the regime and opened hostilities. The decision had been taken during a secret meeting of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party presided over by Lenin himself, who had finally left Finland. In order to not be recognised during the journey, he had shaved his beard and covered his bold head with a wig.

Thus plans had been made for the *coup d'état* which went down in history under the name of the October Revolution, according to the Russian calendar, or the November Revolution, according to the Gregorian one.

The prelude to the new phase of the Revolution was an article by Lenin which was published in five hundred thousand copies and distributed by the Soviet, even in the remotest corners of Russia.

The article stated: 'In the collectivist world whose advent we salute today, each worker will have the right to a plot of land which he will be allowed to cultivate himself, or with the help of his family and relatives, without having to resort to wage labour.'

These words went straight to the farmers' hearts. All that remained to be done was to organise a coup to seize power, which was in nobody's hands, really. With this aim in view, a commission was set up comprised of the Caucasian Stalin, the Pole Dzerzhinsky, and three Jews known under the pseudonyms of Sverdlov, Bubnov, and Uritsky. The specific duty of the commission was to organise the uprising of the troops; hence, its members were also enlisted in the revolutionary military committee headed by Trotsky.

The Bolsheviks' tactic was not to openly attack the government, but rather to take advantage of the disorder and anarchy in order to gain control of the state's vital organs, which were concentrated in the capital. These included the telegraph and telephone exchange, the powerhouse, the gasometers, the railway stations, and the bridges over the Neva. In such a way, the insurgents would cut the government off and paralyse it.

All Trotsky needed to reach this goal were a handful of resolute men carefully chosen among the technicians of the various services that had to be paralysed. These men would be helped by others armed with hand grenades, who would cause a moment of panic in the ongoing disorder. Indeed, for this plan to be feasible, an orgy of disorder was needed of the sort impossible to imagine for those who were not in Saint Petersburg in that cold and foggy autumn of 1917.

Trotsky easily found the men he needed in the underworld of Saint Petersburg, which was teeming with countless hungry deserters and political criminals, as well as ordinary ones, since the gates of the penal colonies and prisons had been opened.

Still, the cunning Jew who had conceived this daring plan, which was destined to produce such a disproportionate effect, kept his daring within strict boundaries, as is customary for his race. He did not personally expose himself, but had an idealistic and unknown *goy* pull the chestnuts out of the fire: Vladimir Antonov-Ovseenko, a former Tsarist officer who had spent much of his life in a penal colony.

This group of rascals easily infiltrated the services they were familiar with and took control of them, while their comrades spread panic outside. While the ministers and Provisional Committee, unaware of what was happening, continued quibbling about democracy, the government was put out of action.

Immediately afterwards there was the attack on the Winter Palace, where the dummies in power had assembled under Kerensky's presidency.

The sailors of Kronstadt had seized the *Aurora*, a warship anchored on the Neva. They opened fire on the old Imperial residence, without the batteries of the Peter and Paul Fortress on the opposite bank of the river doing anything at all to defend the palace. Other armed men later made their way into the meeting hall and arrested all the ministers except Kerensky, who somehow managed to escape.

Trotsky's partisans, who are eager to give their hero all the credit for the November coup,

claim that this is how things went.

Stalin's partisans uphold a different claim. According to them, it was the committee headed by Stalin which was responsible for everything, since it inspired the garrison troops to rise up.

We believe there is some truth to both versions. In fact, nobody on that historic day knew exactly what was happening, including Lenin, who was hiding in a suburb of the capital, and up until the last moment remained unaware of the fact that he was already the master of Russia – just as Kerensky did not know for certain that he no longer was.

The question of who is to take credit for most of the events of that day is of no interest to us at all. Behind men like Lenin, Stalin, and Trotsky, just as behind Milyukov, Guchkov, Kerensky, and Chernov in the first act of the tragedy, lay Jacob Schiff and the international Jewish consortium.³ And even before the birth of this visible author⁴ of the Russian Revolution – who remains unknown to most of our contemporaries⁵ – the work which led to it had long been underway. Indeed, other valets have replaced Lenin after his death and Trotsky after his banishment, just as others will replace Stalin when he is no longer be around or will have become a troublesome figure.

These servants and successive leaders of the world conspiracy will pass. But the initial plan will remain and be forever carried on: its perfect progression does not depend upon their ephemeral existence.

Riots broke out in the streets of Saint Petersburg, and the city's dismayed inhabitants were no longer sure just who their master was. Meanwhile, alone in a small room of the Smolny Institute, Lenin spent the night drafting a decree on the expropriation of the land of the nobles, the Church, and the state.

Lenin knew perfectly well that there are minutes in history that count as years, and which decide the fate of empires.

When the loyal Stalin came to inform him about the progress of the insurrection, Lenin – who had not yet been in the streets – showed him the paper he was writing, adding these highly revealing words, which have been recorded by a witness: 'If we are still in time to issue it, no one will ever manage to drive us out of here.'

The time they had was quite enough. Lenin's prophecy has come true.

On the evening of 8 November 1917, as the rioting and revolution swept across Saint Petersburg, the Communist insurrection triumphed.

It was exactly 8:40 PM when thunderous acclamations announced the Soviet committee's entrance at the Smolny Institute, with Lenin – the red Tsar – as the master of the hour.

He stood up. Resting on the ledge of the platform, he scanned his audience with flashing eyes, apparently impervious to the huge ovation which had been going on for several minutes. When it wore off, all he said was: 'We shall now proceed to construct the socialist order.'

And so his famous decree was issued.

Another tremendous outburst shook the hall.

Thursday, 8 November: the Sun rose over a city at the height of fervour and confusion, over a nation carried away by a tremendous storm.

A new era in the history of the world was about to begin.

It opens the age of the final apocalypse.

1 Evola omits this paragraph.—Ed.

2 Evola has, ‘of their democratic country’.—Ed.

3 Evola adds, ‘the occult front of world subversion’.—Ed.

4 Evola has, ‘birth of these visible authors’.—Ed.

5 Evola omits this phrase from his edition.—Ed.

Europe Strikes Back¹

Following the rise of Bolshevism and the signing of the peace treaties, events have followed one another in Europe with such a pace that it difficult to provide any overall picture of them.

It initially seemed as though the anti-traditional bloc controlled by Freemasonry and Jewry in its various forms – the democratic, capitalist, and socialist-Communist one – had secured such a great triumph that it would long enjoy undisputed hegemony. After the major obstacles had violently been removed and three of the greatest European monarchies destroyed, a series of revolutions in both the winners' and the losers' countries were meant to complete the work of the War: an attempt was made to employ proletarian and workers' movements as assault squads, to pave the way for the achievement of the most far-reaching goals. Simultaneously, an attack was launched against two sectors of crucial importance: the cultural and the financial.

The history of so-called inflation, just like that of many other aspects of the occult war, still waits to be written: for here too the current opinion, according to which this phenomenon is one neither provoked nor carefully directed, but something simply bound to happen on account of impersonal causes, is yet another of the erroneous views intentionally spread by the front of world subversion in order to conceal its action. Inflation struck not only the countries which had lost the war, but ultimately those which had won it as well. Through the wide-scale plundering of liquid wealth, it led to the attainment of two specific goals. First of all, inflation destroyed the independent financial power of the nations affected by it. Secondly, it led the masses into such misery and hence exasperation as to turn them into passive material in the hands of the agitators. The two manoeuvres thus converged – the indirect one, carried out through the speculations of high finance; and the direct, revolutionary, and proletarian one.

At the same time, an offensive was launched on the cultural front with the aim of suppressing and demeaning all values, ethical principles, and customs. These forms of so-called 'cultural Bolshevism', which are current in the fields of art, theatre, criticism, cinema, and in the intellectual world, have essentially been spread by Jews. Their action is either concomitant or preparatory to that of militant Bolshevism and social subversion proper. Piling disrepute upon all notions of authority, tradition, race, family, heroism, religion, and idealism, while emphasising internationalism and cosmopolitanism, has been the aim of this offensive of the secret revolutionary front in its pursuit of what are ultimately – as we were saying – global goals. Generally speaking, it sought to engender physical, economic, and moral exhaustion, apathy, the confusion of ideas and values, defeatism, and materialism and corruption among both winners and losers to such an extent that all nations would be stripped of their independence and turned into mere tools in the hands of the same forces which had triumphed in Russia.

Even in those places where Communist revolts were contained through various cultural or political forms – democratic, humanitarian, communitarian, or even national ones at

times – the hegemony of these forces proved no less tangible in the immediate aftermath of the War. It may be argued that what needed to be done was to again carry out a sort of broad, sweeping action. Politically, the main task appeared to be to carry out a timely convergence manoeuvre to link the two big international fronts, which were largely controlled by Israel and only apparently – for the tactical reasons we have stressed – mutually opposed: the financial international, wearing the mask of ‘democracy’, and the Marxist and Communist international.

A series of unexpected events occurred, however, which hindered this attempt to complete the anti-traditional arrangement and Judeo-Masonic victory. The real men behind this triumph, bolstered by their success and certain that the field was theirs, must have forgotten that one of the crucial factors of their success was the fact that they had acted behind the scenes, in secret. In their self-assurance, and confident their enemies had been vanquished, they had started acting openly. This proved a fatal move on their part. Deep-seated forces stuck back of the sort which tend to manifest themselves in an organism when it is experiencing a life-threatening crisis. It is to these forces which Europe, on the brink of the abyss, might owe its salvation.

The first setback suffered by the revolution in the aftermath of the War – one that went almost unnoticed at the time – was the overthrowing of Communism in Hungary after four months of dictatorship (Bela Kuhn, Jew). This was followed by the quashing of Spartacism, a German form of Communism, in Munich (Kurt Eisner, Jew; Levin, Jew) and Berlin (Liebknecht, half-Jew; Rosa Luxemburg, Jew). Then the red troops were defeated at the gates of Warsaw, and this stopped the Bolshevik invasion which was about to sweep over central Europe.

A new and unexpected event suddenly occurred not long afterwards which really worried the secret leaders of world politics. The Fascist reaction against the Bolshevik peril which had surfaced in Italy changed this country – which had long since slipped into democratic anarchy and become a hotbed of Masonic sects – into a new and independent nation destined to lay the initial foundations for a positive reconstruction of Europe. The first consequence of this was the suppression of Freemasonry in Italy, an unprecedented event in contemporary history, and one which struck the front of world subversion as a real challenge.

The latter, however, did not pay too much attention to Fascism at first, which it regarded as merely a local and passing phenomenon. The front was busy working elsewhere, upholding the territorial clauses of the Treaty of Versailles and preventing any form of revisionism.

Meanwhile, Portugal too freed itself from anarchy and began to undergo a profound regeneration, which also entailed the suppression of Freemasonry. Then Marxist Social Democracy (Julius Deutsch, Jew; Otto Bauer, Jew) was crushed in Vienna, and Hitler’s rise to power signalled the end of all prospects for Communism in central Europe. But National Socialism did not simply attack Freemasonry: it also turned against Jewry in an even more resolute way. This was an event of decisive importance: for the first time, a big state was challenging Jewish supremacy, just when Jewry believed to have finally become

the master of the world. Not long afterwards, Germany quit the League of Nations and broke off its relations with the United States, which in the immediately previous period had fallen under the almost complete control of Judaised finance. Italy is now standing on Germany's side, since it shares its revisionist views. Thus an age of new rapprochements has begun: between Germany and Poland, Germany and Hungary, Italy and Germany.

We are witnessing the formation of a new front of nations lined up against Jewry, Freemasonry, internationalism, and Communism. Faced with such a serious and broad threat, the secret forces of world subversion have felt the need to take up a defensive position, or even to counterattack by deploying new techniques.

Particularly significant, in this respect, is the creation of the 'Popular Front'. In order to bring about the unity of socialist and revolutionary forces on the level of the anti-Fascist struggle, first trade unions joined forces, then an alliance was formed between the Second and Third International, and finally mutual solidarity was fostered among the 'national fronts' of various countries. The Italian feats in Abyssinia are enabling the mobilisation of all pacifists and democrats against anti-Masonic Italy; yet the tool of the League of Nations, which is being used for this purpose, is actually producing the opposite effect: it is revealing its incapacity to impose any sanctions as well as its inner inconsistency, when it was intended to serve as a Masonic-democratic super-state for controlling all peoples.

One of the few Catholic monarchies to have escaped the collapse of traditional Europe was the Spanish. Through a combination of circumstances, Spain has become the focus of this directly revolutionary action: one by one, the moves of the occult war are being repeated in this country. Like the Tsar, the King of Spain was tricked into abdicating: he was told that this was the will of the nation, when actually in the elections – merely municipal, not general ones – the majority of votes had been in favour of the monarchy, except in some major cities. The farce of a democratic republic followed, which soon showed its real face by giving way to Communist radicalism. But in the most critical and decisive moment of a battle it already believed to have won, here too the Judeo-Masonic front which is in cahoots with Moscow suddenly found itself faced with an unexpected reaction: the counterattack of the nationalist forces led by Franco. Spain turned into an international battlefield: for the first time, the forces of the red international clashed with the legionary forces of the anti-revolutionary international.

At the same time, the internal situation in Russia worsened. The numerous executions of Soviet leaders and the literal decapitation of the leading officers of the Red Army reveal just in what a state this Judeo-Communist paradise is in. The anti-Communist pact among Italy, Japan, and Germany further poses an insurmountable obstacle to it. Another serious symptom of Russia's awareness of its own weakness, and of the inefficiency of the so-called 'Red Army of the world revolution' when faced with the prospect of a bitter war, is the fact that it has failed to react against the war waged by Japan upon Communised and fragmented China. Thus, in that well-known and serious frontier incident, Russia deemed it best to avoid all complications rather than use the event as a pretext for counterattacking and paralysing the Japanese.²

Over the past twenty tumultuous and uncertain years, however, the most serious defeat

suffered by the forces of world subversion has been the Czechoslovakian crisis. Czechoslovakia constituted a real centre of interest for the democratic powers – and indirectly Russia itself – as it controlled all the routes across central Europe. The territorial definition the country was given in the peace treaties was essentially the result of tactical reasons: these treaties, which had invoked the nationality principle in order to destroy the Hapsburg empire, completely ignored it when creating Czechoslovakia, a puzzle of nations and races far more absurd than former Austria, since no higher principle or genuine shared tradition was there to provide any unity in diversity. Only strategic reasoning could justify the structure of the state which had Prague as its capital and which was placed under Czech mandate, so to speak, by virtue of the traditional and deep-seated anti-German and anti-Hapsburg feelings harboured by this Slav people, and especially its Masonic leaders. Czechoslovakia's function was to prevent any restoration in Austria and to control the Bohemian basin, which is a key strategic area in central-Danubian Europe. Czechoslovakia enjoyed the support of the two other powers of the Little Entente:³ Romania and Yugoslavia. According to the original plan drawn up by the 'big democracies', the role of these countries was to act as a 'block' to prevent not only defeated Germany, but also victorious Italy, from entering central Balkan Europe.

This system too was shattered. The first blow was the new politics of Yugoslavia, which were favourable to both Germany and Italy. The second – and decisive – blow was the annexation of Austria to Germany. This is a typical example of a 'counter-blow' caused by anti-traditional hatred. Czechoslovakia, with its Masonic dictatorship masked as a democracy, still feared the ghost of the Hapsburgs. On several occasions, Benes formally declared, 'We do not like the prospect of an *Anschluss*, but if we were to choose between it and the restoration of the Monarchy, we would not hesitate to choose the *Anschluss* and immediately react against the Hapsburgs.' This is a typical case of blindness, since through the country's eastern frontier (the Austro-Czech), now German and far weaker than the western one (the German-Czech), the solution adopted here was destined to profoundly damage the strategic position of Czechoslovakia. Because of the impact of the *Anschluss* on the Sudeten Germans, it was also destined to make coexistence between the latter and the Czechs impossible, thereby bringing about the crisis of the Czechoslovakian state.

While it is German national interest which has benefited the most from these events, it should nonetheless be observed that real solidarity now exists among anti-Masonic, anti-Jewish, anti-Communist and nationalist⁴ political forces, whose prestige, far from waning, is increasing by the day. The front of world subversion must reckon with these forces, since they are now counterattacking in all sectors.

The most serious danger, in this respect, is that the attack – or rather counterattack – of the secret forces of corruption might take place in another domain: not externally, in terms of international political forces realised through wars and conflicts, but internally, through actions analogous to that which has so often turned a certain kind of nationalism into a tool for revolutionary, anti-traditional, and anti-hierarchical change. What will prove decisive in future struggles, and for the prospect of a general European reconstruction, is

the ability of the new national movements to steer clear of certain forms of extremism: for while these may provide a purely defensive and tactical temporary defence, they leave no room for any superior idea – for a transcendent point of reference capable of leading the movements within the framework of a new, sacred unity. Bolshevism, externally vanquished, must not resurface internally under the guise of new levelling myths or ‘social’ formulas detrimental to the traditional values of spiritual personality, difference, hierarchy, and authority from on high. The anti-democratic ideals of strength, power, virility, and empire must not degenerate into the materialistic forms of a new paganism; instead, they must find – as in our best Middle Ages – a superior justification and real transfiguration, so that the final clash against world subversion will not be merely a fight between enemies situated on the same level, but a war waged by a new ‘Holy Alliance’, or genuine ‘holy war’, between the forces of the spirit and those of the anti-spirit, between matter and chaos.

The supreme form of the ‘occult war’ is that which is taking place on a subtle level through a careful and imperceptible deformation and deviation of the ideas and principles upheld by those who are striking back against the most outward forms of decadence and subversion. Today, now that this counterstrike is in full swing, the various national movements of restoration must watch out for any action of this sort, many examples of which have been noted in the present book. Strict adherence to the traditional spirit is the most effective weapon in this respect, for it is the spirit of truth itself, and is stronger than all myths which have been developed to meet the needs of an uncertain twilight age laden with the rubble of so many past catastrophes. When our front will have grown steadfast in this inner and spiritual field as well, and free of any attenuation or compromise, in the face of all future contingencies it will be entitled to pronounce that ancient, magnificent formula in its full meaning: *Non praevalébunt*.⁵

¹ This final chapter was not part of the original French edition. By agreement with de Poncins, it was written and added by Evola himself.—Ed.

² In the summer of 1938 the Japanese, who were then occupying China, sent troops into the Soviet Union through Manchuria, believing that the Russians had misaligned the border between the two nations which had been established by the Treaty of Peking. This led to fighting between the Red Army and the Japanese army which lasted into the following year, and which ultimately led to an armistice and a proclamation of neutrality between the two powers.—Ed.

³ The Little Entente was a series of agreements for collective defence signed by Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Yugoslavia in 1920 in the event of an attack by Hungary, as it was feared at the time that Hungary might attempt to reabsorb these territories as part of a restoration of the Hapsburg monarchy. Although this danger quickly passed, the Little Entente was maintained as a collective security arrangement against the Soviet Union and other threats, supported by France, and later even began to serve as a means for economic integration. It gradually weakened and eventually collapsed in 1938.—Ed.

⁴ Evola typically uses ‘national’ in place of ‘nationalist’.—Ed.

⁵ Latin: ‘they shall not prevail’.—Ed.

APPENDIX I: Considerations On The Occult War¹

Julius Evola

The occult war is that war waged by the forces of global subversion from behind the scenes, utilising means which are almost invariably invisible to ordinary methods of investigation. The notion of occult war belongs, so to speak, to a three-dimensional view of history, whereby history is considered not superficially, according to the two dimensions of apparent causes, events, and driving forces, but rather according to its third dimension, that of *depth*: an underground current of decisive forces and influences often irreducible to the simple human element, be it individual or collective.

It is worth clarifying the meaning of the term ‘underground’, as it is not to be identified with any obscure and irrational substrate of objective history – something which stands in relation to the known face of history as the subconscious stands to the waking consciousness of the individual. This, by contrast, might be an apt analogy for those who are *objects* rather than *subjects* of history, according to this three-dimensional view of events: people who show no awareness of the real influences affecting them in their thoughts and actions nor of the aims accomplished through them, and thus appear to be centred more on their subconscious and unconscious than on their waking consciousness. In this respect, it is on the level of the subconscious that the most decisive steps of the occult war are taken. Yet from the point of view of the real *subjects* of history, matters stand rather different: we should not speak here of the subconscious or unconscious, but rather consider forces that are more than intelligent – forces that know perfectly well what they want and what the most opportune means might be for them to reach their goals. It would be an extremely dangerous mistake to suppose that this substrate of history is comprised of the ‘irrational’, ‘life’, ‘becoming’, or any other of those ill-defined entities which modern historicism has come up with in its attempt to transcend positivist historiography. Indeed, I regard this as one of the suggestions that have been promoted via occult means in certain milieus precisely as part of the strategy of the occult war in modern times. But I shall explain things more clearly later on. For the time being, suffice it to note the following point: we should not shroud the third dimension of history in the fog of abstract philosophical views; rather, we should regard it as being inhabited and occupied by specific ‘intelligences’ that almost invariably have manifested themselves through certain secret societies and organisations, without ever entirely coinciding or reaching absolute fulfilment through any of them.

Among the various conceptions of history to be found in the West, the one most likely to lead to such views is probably the Catholic one. This conception typically regards history not as a mechanism regulated by natural, political, economic, or social causes, but as the unfolding of a sort of plan (a ‘providential’ plan) opposed by enemy forces and their historical emissaries. These take on either the moralising designation of ‘forces of evil’, or the religious, Christian one of anti-Christian forces, or the forces of the Antichrist. A conception of this sort represents a good starting point, provided it is transposed from the

theological level to the practical one, by turning it into a general principle for a detailed interpretation of events. Once generalised, this conception is also to be tested in relation to non-Christian civilisations. With reference to the latter, and to human institutions, it will be more appropriate to simply speak of forces of Tradition² and anti-Tradition, of spiritual hierarchy and revolutionary subversion, of *cosmos* and *chaos*. Naturally, from one particular perspective, the anti-traditional forces will be seen to coincide with the anti-Catholic ones, as according to Catholic tradition the latter seek to fight the traditional spirit in general by undermining the bases of all hierarchy and thus overthrow its historical representatives.

One cannot stress too strongly the need to embrace a view of this kind today, which should be regarded not as a philosophical speculation among many others, but as an essential aid to true action. I would here like to quote a passage from the famous *Protocols*, which I already drew attention to in the past: ‘The purely brute mind of the GOYIM is incapable of use for analysis and observation, and still more for the foreseeing whither a certain manner of setting a question may tend. In this difference in capacity for thought between the GOYIM and ourselves [the Elders of Zion] may be clearly discerned the seal of our position as the Chosen People and of our higher quality of humanness, in contradistinction to the brute mind of the GOYIM. Their eyes are open, but see nothing before them and do not invent (unless perhaps, material things)’ (XV). The term *goyim* is used to describe non-Jews in this particular passage, where Israel is presented as the main agent of world subversion. Yet the term may also be more generally applied to those people I have described as ‘objects of history’. It is truly alarming to note how often this verdict concerning *goyim* still holds true today. The point of view of most so-called ‘men of action’, when compared to that of their concealed enemies, may well be regarded as childish: these men focus all their forces on what is tangible, but are incapable of discerning relations of cause and effect except in extremely limited fields of application, which are almost invariably of a gross, material nature. Besides, they show a complete lack of principles, for in the vast majority of cases they believe that the point of view of action cannot be ‘dogmatically’ subordinated to any principles, as it must meet the ‘compelling needs of the present’. Regrettably, this is still the level of many counter-revolutionary forces today. This situation may be compared to that of someone who is perfectly equipped for high-altitude mountaineering – with hiking boots, a sleeping bag, a rope, and an ice pick – and has passed many difficult trials, but then when faced with an expanse of water, a lake or the sea, chooses to throw himself in enthusiastically, in the belief that his equipment will still be of use to him and will help him advance. Actually, he will simply sink faster.

The occult war is waged in the field of what – to borrow an image drawn from the empirical sciences – we might call ‘imponderables’ or imponderable quantities. This war often causes almost imperceptible changes, from which striking effects gradually, but fatally, proceed. It hardly ever operates by opposing given forces against others; rather, it manipulates existing ones so as to obtain the desired effects. What Wundt³ once called the ‘heterogeneity of ends’ plays a crucial role here: it is a matter of ensuring that while certain forces or men think they are striving for and reaching a given aim – and doing it

alone – they may actually bring about or foster something very different, something which reveals the presence of an influence and intelligence transcending them. It is for this reason that on another occasion, in the pages of this very same magazine, I argued that an examination of the ‘differential’ between what is willed and what takes place, between principles or programmes and their actual historical consequences, provides the best evidence for those wishing to find out what the real forces at work in history may be.

In this article, I wish to move beyond general matters to discuss some of the methods most frequently used in our age by the masked forces of world subversion in their attempt to cover up their own actions, prevent those of their enemies, and maintain their influence. The reader should be informed that in what I am about to say, I will often be drawing upon observations René Guénon has made in various works of his. I believe that when it comes to such matters, Guénon’s expertise is unmatched by any contemporary Western author.

1. *The positivist suggestion.* We should grow accustomed to the thought that the so-called ‘positive’ manner of writing history and considering events is not so much the spontaneous product or the prejudice of a narrow-minded worldview as much as a *suggestion* which the anti-traditional forces have methodically spread in modern culture with the aim of ‘covering up’ their own actions. Those who believe that history is simply made by men and exclusively determined by economic, political, and social factors fail to see anything beyond this. But a world that ‘fails to see anything beyond this’ is precisely what is needed by those wishing to act in a subterranean way. A civilisation dominated by the ‘positivist’ prejudice offers an ideal condition for the pursuit of action in the ‘third dimension’ – and this is exactly the case in contemporary civilisation.

Above, I referred to interpretations that are no longer ‘positivist’, but rather based on abstract ideas such as ‘becoming’, ‘life’, or even the ‘Spirit’. This leads us to consider the way in which a second instrument of the occult war is applied, namely:

2. *The technique of surrogates.* This technique is adopted whenever there is a risk of ‘awakening’ and certain energies threaten to transcend the mere level of ideas, where the forces of subversion can more easily pursue their occult strategy. In the aforementioned case, vague ideas such as those of ‘becoming’, ‘life’, and ‘absolute Spirit’ merely serve as bait thrown to those no longer satisfied with the positivist approach, to prevent them from turning their gazes in the right direction. The field of action becomes as shrouded in the fog of these ideas as it was in the dark night of positivist agnosticism.

The ‘technique of surrogates’, however, is developed in a far more characteristic and effective way as:

3. *The tactic of counterfeits.* Once the effects of this destructive work reach the material plane, they may give rise to visible phenomena, to the point of eliciting a reaction. This reaction will then seek vague symbols and myths which might serve as the basis for an attempt at reconstruction. Indeed, some may even be found that are well suited to the purpose. These will almost invariably be symbols and points of reference that draw upon the traditional past in their historical aspects, which will then be evoked from ancestral depths by the forces of an organism that feels threatened with utter destruction. In such

cases, the occult war is not waged in a direct manner: the symbols chosen are not opposed; they are rather prevented from circulating, or else distortions of them are promoted. As a consequence, the movement of reaction is curbed, deviated, or even led in the opposite direction, so that it might become subject to the very influences present in the evil it was intended to counter and the very decadence it was meant to rise above – and indeed will still believe itself to be rising above.

This tactic may be adopted in various domains, from the political to the spiritual, and is proving particularly effective today. A few examples will be in order.

The most typical example is that of ‘traditionalism’. A vague desire to return to tradition – i.e., to a hierarchical and qualitative order centred on transcendent spirituality and an elite of its qualified and legitimate representatives – will be deviated into the form of ‘traditionalism’. What this consists of are vague assumption of an amateurish or militant sort that confuse Tradition with customs and routines, leading to a narrow particularism which is limited to transmitted forms whose spirit is never truly grasped. This is fair game for the enemies of Tradition and those who, under the pretext of anti-traditionalism, seek to deliver a genuine blow against Tradition and to further encourage revolutionary subversion. In such a way, the forces of reaction are held back and the manoeuvre easily attains its goal.

What has just been described may well occur in certain extremist milieus in relation to the idea of race, on account of specific materialist and zoological assumptions. The same applies to the Nordic-Aryan idea as well as that of the pagan. These are all ideas that could unquestionably promote creative action and attempts at restoration among certain peoples of the North, provided they are grasped and presented anew according to their genuine nature and ancient spiritual and traditional significance. As they are found in the aforementioned milieus, however, they suggest the influence of diverting action of the kind I have just described: first of all, because of a lack of principles; secondly, because of the serious misunderstandings and distortions surrounding the notion of ancient ‘Aryanness’; and finally, because of the tyranny of contingent interests and irrational impulses. In the context of the new Italy, everything should be done to avoid this happening when Romanness is sometimes evoked. The idea of ancient Rome is no doubt among those ideas which might contribute the most to reconstruction: we must thus ensure that its effectiveness will not be paralysed by counterfeits, mere rhetorical exhumations, or academic, erudite, archaeological, or even simply juridical and political assumptions, which naturally tend to completely ignore the central force and soul of Rome as a symbol.

4. *The tactic of inversion.* The secret forces of world subversion knew perfectly well that the fundamental premise behind the order to be destroyed was the supernatural element: the spirit conceived not as a philosophical abstraction, but as a superior reality and the final goal in a process of transcendent integration of one’s personality. Once they had limited the influence which the Catholic tradition still exercised in this respect (and we will not go into the details of what means were adopted to accomplish this goal), the forces of subversion strove to deviate and paralyse all new aspirations towards the supernatural that might have surfaced outside the dominant religion. The whole of what

may be termed *neo-spiritualism* – and which includes all the various Theosophical, Spiritualist, Orientalising, and ‘occult’ sects – may be said to derive from this manoeuvre. Again, what we find here are almost exclusively distortions, counterfeits, and the perversion of spiritual doctrines on the part of unqualified people who often appear to have succumbed to a genuinely demonic influence.

The result achieved was twofold. First, it was easy to extend the discredit that in numerous cases rightly fell on these counterfeits to the doctrines themselves, thus putting the latter in a condition to no longer pose a threat. One may also mention the fact that in recent times this manoeuvre has been accomplished by playing on political factors: there are certain circles which, in all good faith, see nothing but ‘Freemasonry’ (which they consider synonymous with revolution, opposition to Christianity, and internationalist subversion) wherever secret associations and esoteric symbols are discussed, even when one is referring to ancient traditions whose originally spiritual and aristocratic nature should be known to all.

Secondly, through misunderstood theories and false practices, all those forces which, having been stifled by materialism, were yearning for something extra-natural have been channelled not towards the supernatural, but towards the sub-natural, which is to say the subconscious, Spiritualism, and more generally a world that, far from representing any integration of one’s personality, can only foster its collapse and disintegration – to the point of turning the individual into a tool in the hands of the most obscure ‘influences’. Through neo-Spiritualism, the threat posed by genuine spirituality has been contained and reduced to a minimum.

5. *The tactic of the ricochet attack.* This consists in causing one of the forces which are to be struck down because of their enduring traditional character to take action. Such action will first target a force similar to the original one, apparently strengthening and increasing the latter. Eventually, however, it will ricochet against the initial force and bring it to its ruin, just as it has done with the second force. Thus by means of specific forms of infiltration, the secret forces of world subversion often lead the representatives of a given tradition to defend it by discrediting other traditions: those who yield to this manoeuvre do not realise that by attacking tradition as embodied by another folk or civilisation for self-serving motives or contingent and inferior reasons, they are causing their own tradition to be attacked through a ricochet effect sooner or later, so to speak. The forces of world subversion heavily rely on this tactic and do their best to submit higher ideas to self-serving interests, pride, ambitions, and proselytising tendencies: for they know full well that this is the best way to erode all genuine unity and solidarity, and thus bring about a state of conflict that will make things much easier for them.

Under this category we might also list any Machiavellian use of revolutionary forces. Short-sighted political leaders have often believed that fostering or supporting revolutions in hostile nations was the best way for them to defend the interests of their own countries. Without realising it, in doing so they were bringing about the opposite result: while they thought they were using the revolution as a tool, they were actually becoming tools of the revolution themselves. Eventually, the revolution reached them, after having swept across

their enemies. It may be said that modern history, particularly since the French Revolution, has been the theatre of a subversion that has tragically occurred in this manner. One cannot emphasise too much that only absolute, ascetic, and unflinching loyalty to an idea can provide a safeguard against the forces of the occult war: whenever this level is abandoned and obedience is merely given to contingent factors, the front of resistance will be broken – and with it, any chance of real autonomy.

We should mention here the most recent manifestation of this sort of manoeuvre: the ideology based on the ‘nationality principle’, the ‘self-determination of peoples’, and imperialism – as promoted by the Allies in order to mobilise all forces against the Central Empires and vanquish them – represents the best possible ideology for sparking a wide-scale revolt of the so-called ‘coloured’ nations against the great European powers in an attempt to strip the latter of their supremacy.

6. *The tactic of the scapegoat.* When the occult forces of world subversion fear they may be exposed to some degree, they make sure that their enemies will focus their attention on certain elements which are only partially responsible, or only in a subordinate fashion, for their misdeeds. Reaction will thus target these elements exclusively, which will serve as scapegoats. The occult forces will then be free to resume their work, as their opponents will believe they have identified the enemy and dealt with it. We have often warned certain anti-Semitic extremists that they must be careful, lest by seeing the Jew everywhere they fall victim to this sort of trap. The same warning may also be given to those who see Freemasonry or Protestantism everywhere – and these are but a few examples, for similar processes take place in many other domains as well. One must be wary of one-sidedness and bear in mind the general plane on which the occult forces we must fight are operating.

7. *The tactic of dilutions.* This represents a particular aspect of the ‘tactic of surrogates’. To understand its nature, we must start from the idea that the process which has led to the current general crisis has remote origins and has developed through various phases (corresponding to specific forms of civilisation, state, ethics, and so on – see our book *Revolt against the Modern World*).⁴ In each of these phases the crisis was already present, albeit in a less acute and more diluted form – potentially rather than in actuality. The theory of ‘progress’, or evolutionism, may be regarded as one of the suggestions spread by the occult forces of subversion with the aim of diverting people’s attention from its origins, so as to further the process of dissolution through false mirages, such as the illusion of the triumphs of the techno-mechanical civilisation.

The tragic events of recent times, however, have partly stripped this hypnosis of its efficacy: for many have begun to realise that the alleged march of progress is nothing but a race toward the abyss and that it is necessary for us to make an inversion. The occult front has thus employed all available means to prevent any new radical reaction. One of its favourite methods has been the spread of prejudices against ‘anachronism’ and ‘what is no longer suited to our times’. It has also driven those forces which looked toward their origins to turn instead towards one of its preceding stages, in which the crisis and evil were present in less advanced, and hence less visible, forms. This trap has also worked

well. The leaders of world subversion know, of course, that having reached this stage the threat has been averted, as it is simply a matter of following along the same route again, and then bringing about the dissolution of the forces that had awoken and sought to react by turning back.

For this tactic, too, many historical examples may be mentioned, recent as well as remote ones. It is particularly the leaders of contemporary anti-subversive movements who should watch out for this tactic. In all frankness – for lack of frankness in such matters would be a sin – there are certain aspects of contemporary nationalism which it would be worth examining in detail from this point of view. It is common knowledge that, in the past, the idea of nation possessed an anti-traditional, anti-hierarchical, and revolutionary character with respect to previous oecumenical, imperial, and feudal civilisations. Today, it is the nation which is chiefly invoked in the fight against the most extreme forms of crisis and subversion, as embodied by the various red internationals. It is necessary, therefore, to develop a different concept of nation from that which renders it a step along the itinerary which is leading toward what we must now fight. Already many years ago, in the pages of this very magazine,⁵ I sought to provide the necessary points of reference to address and solve this problem by drawing a distinction between two kinds of nationalism. Readers should refer to this essay of mine.

8. *The tactic of the replacement of principles by people.* It is undeniably the case that, in many respects, the decay of traditional institutions began with that of their leaders and representatives. Yet the latter were not its sole cause: for genuine dissolution and involution to take place, the tactic of the replacement of principles by people must first be adopted. This is an additional tool of the occult war, and operates as follows: when the representative of a given principle proves to be unworthy of it, criticism is extended from this person to the principle itself. One will not conclude from this that the single representative is not at the level of the principle and must be replaced by someone else capable of embodying it; rather, the conclusion reached will be that the principle itself is false or harmful, and must be replaced by a different one.

Is it not the case that the attack against degenerate, vane, or dissolute aristocrats has all too often turned into an attack against the principle of aristocracy itself and into an instrument of demagoguery? And is this not also the case with the subversive and heretical action of Luther, which found its alibi in the corruption of the representatives of the Church of Rome? History is rich in episodes of this sort, each coinciding with a given moment in the process of world subversion. Let us bear in mind that the ancient hierarchical order consisted of spiritual authority, under which stood a warrior aristocracy, followed by the bourgeois class, and finally the working masses. The collapse of this traditional order was in many ways brought about by means of the tactic I have just mentioned. Thus the warrior aristocracy rose up against the fallen representatives of purely spiritual authority not in order to replace them with other, more worthy representatives of the same principle, but in order to emancipate themselves by making a claim to supreme authority. At a later stage – in other words, in a later civilisation – the Third Estate⁶ rose up against the degenerate warrior aristocracy, not so that the latter

might give way to genuine aristocrats, but merely to seize power for itself. To consider yet another phase, the process working against capitalism and the bourgeoisie (which is to say against the Third Estate) in its destructive and negative aspects does not pursue any reform, but is merely a pretext for the revolt of the proletariat and its usurpation of power – sunk lower and lower – on the part of proletarians (via Bolshevism and Communism).

* * *

The fact that, due to space restrictions, I have only provided a few examples and chiefly focused on illustrating certain principles will not, I hope, prevent readers from realising how widely these principles may be applied and what results may be attained by qualified individuals wishing to methodically adopt them in any given field. It may safely be argued that there is hardly any area in which the forces of world subversion have not waged their occult warfare. In fact, those areas which might seem less likely to be affected by such things are precisely the ones that, in principle, should be approached with the greatest caution.

It is worth stressing once more that it is not a matter here of ‘philosophical positions’, but of something quite tangible. No leader or fighter on the front of counter-subversion and tradition can claim to be prepared and up to his real tasks unless he has first developed an ability to clearly discern this underground network of causes. He must readily identify the action of those invisible tools our enemy employs in every age which, like the present one, heralds a time of ultimate decision-making and the final struggle for an entire cycle of civilisation.

[1](#) Originally published as ‘Considerazioni sulla guerra occulta’ in *La Vita Italiana*, vol. XXVI, no. 298 (January 1938), pp. 27-37.—Ed.

[2](#) Evola is here using the term Tradition in the same sense as René Guénon; namely, to refer to a set of transcendental metaphysical principles which lies at the heart of all authentic religions, and which remains the same even when there are differences in the exoteric practices and doctrines.—Ed.

[3](#) Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920) was one of the first psychologists. Wundt first discussed his idea of the ‘heterogeneity of ends’ in his 1882 book, *Ethics*, to denote the phenomenon of how an individual can pursue a particular goal with a certain end in mind, only to discover and introduce other goals into the process along the way which alter one’s original intentions.—Ed.

[4](#) *Revolt against the Modern World* (Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1995).—Ed.

[5](#) ‘Due facce del Nazionalismo’, *Vita Italiana* 216, March 1931. German translation: ‘Der Doppelantlitz des Nationalismus’, *Europäische Revue* 8, October 1932. (English edition: ‘Two Faces of Nationalism’, in Julius Evola, *Fascism versus Tradition* [London: Arkto, 2015].—Ed.)

[6](#) In pre-Revolutionary France, the general assembly of the French government was divided into three States-General: the clergy (First), the nobles (Second), and the commoners (Third).—Ed.

APPENDIX II: Review of Emmanuel Malynski and Léon De Poncins' book *The Occult War*

(July 1936)

René Guénon

Emmanuel Malynski and Léon de Poncins. *The Occult War*. (Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris). – Like the previous works by Mr Léon de Poncins which we have had the chance to discuss in the past, this one contains many entirely correct considerations when it comes to formulating a critique of the modern world. The authors, who rightly denounce common errors such as the belief that revolutions are ‘spontaneous movements’, are among those people who think that modern deviation – whose development over the course of the nineteenth century they examine in particular – must necessarily correspond to a carefully fixed plan, which is known at the very least by those who are leading this ‘occult war’ against everything which presents an intellectually or socially traditional character. Yet when it comes to attributing ‘responsibilities’, we have certain reservations to make; matters, it must be admitted, are not quite as simple or straightforward, since – by definition – what is at work here is not something which shows itself externally, and its apparent pseudo-leaders are more or less little more than unwitting tools. In any case, there is a tendency here to considerably exaggerate the role of the Jews, so much so that they alone are supposed to be the ones ultimately running the world, without making the due distinctions. How can the authors not realise, for instance, that those who are taking an active part in certain milieus are Jews entirely cut off from their own tradition and who, as is often the case, have merely preserved the defects of their race and the negative sides of its particular mentality? Several passages (especially in Chapter 9) closely touch upon certain truths concerning ‘counter-initiation’: it is indeed accurate to say that it is not a matter of common ‘interests’, which merely serve to move vulgar tools, but rather of a ‘faith’ which constitutes ‘a metapsychical mystery that is quite unfathomable even to the developed mind of ordinary man’; and it is no less accurate that ‘[a] Satanic current parallel to the Christian one flows through history’. But this current is not simply directed against Christianity (indeed, this excessively narrow way of viewing things is the likely cause of many ‘errors of perspective’); it is just as much directed against all traditions, be they of the East or West, including Judaism.

As for Freemasonry, the authors may be shocked to learn that the infiltration of modern ideas, to the detriment of the initiatory spirit, has made it not one of the agents of the ‘conspiracy’, but on the contrary, one of its first victims. Besides, by considering some of the contemporary attempts to ‘democratise’ Catholicism itself, which will certainly not have escaped them, by analogy they ought to have grasped what we mean... We dare add that a certain will to divert enquiries by stirring and feeding various ‘hatreds’ (whether of Freemasonry, the Jews, the Jesuits, the ‘yellow peril’ or of anything else) is itself an integral part of the ‘plan’ the authors seek to denounce, and that the ‘hidden agenda’ of certain anti-Masonic attacks would be particularly revealing in this respect. We know all

too well that by insisting on this point, one runs the risk of proving disagreeable to everyone, on all sides; but is this a good enough reason not to speak the truth?

Published by Logik Förlag

- Bacu, Dumitru, (2016). *The Anti-Humans*.
Berlin, Saga; Jacobson, Mats, (2013). *Djuren i Yggdrasil*.
Björkqvist, Björn, red., (2005). *En annan bild av Hitler*.
Björkqvist, Björn, (2014). *Vägvalet*.
Burnham, Stanley, (2015). *Svart intelligens i ett vitt samhälle*.
Carlberg, Carl-Ernfrid, (2012). *Texter, dikter och bilder*.
Chamberlain, Houston Stewart, (2015). *Demokrati och frihet*.
Codreanu, Corneliu Z., (2007). *Till mina legionärer*.
Codreanu, Corneliu Z., (2015). *The Prison Notes*.
Dahlberg, Per, (2006). *Den nordiska ledartanken*.
Degrelle, Léon, (2006). *Epos*.
Degrelle, Léon, (2012). *Fälттåget i Ryssland*.
Dixon Jr., Thomas, (2015). *Vita ryttare*.
Duke, David, (2015). *Den judiska rasismen*.
Duke, David, (2013). *Kämpa för nordisk frihet*.
Eckehart, Meister, (2007). *Hur Sverige blev en mångkultur*.
Faurisson, Robert, (2007). *Mitt liv som revisionist*.
Faurisson, Robert, (2008). *Revisionismens segrar*.
Flodæus, Olof, (2012). *Röd död*.
Garfvé, Henrik, (2006). *Ras och IQ*.
Göring, Hermann, (2015). *Tyskland återfött*.
Hansson, Per, (2012). *Demokratin som dödgrävare*.
Harwood, Richard, (2008). *Nürnbergprocessen*.
Johnson, Greg, (2015) *Nya Högern kontra Gamla högern*.
Kjellén, Rudolf, (2009). *Nationalitetsidén*.
Kjellman, Östen, (2013). *Tankar i skogen*.
Kjellman, Östen, (2015). *Unghögern*.
Kjellman, Östen, (2013). *Vilka började andra världskriget?*
Lindholm, Sven Olov, (2012). *Svensk frihetskamp*.
Macdonald, Andrew, (2012). *Jägaren*.
Macdonald, Andrew, (2009). *Turners dagböcker*.
MacDonald, Kevin, (2012). *Att förstå det judiska inflytandet*.
Nordengruppen, (2011). *Ett annat Tyskland*.
Rami, Ahmed, (2005). *Tabubelagda tankar*.
Rushton, J. Philippe (2014). *Ras, evolution och beteende*.

Söderman, Magnus, (2013). *Den trotsiga*.

Söderman, Magnus, (2011). *Till värn för Norden*.